

Armageddon or Calvary

The Conscientious Objectors
of New Zealand and "The
Process of their Conversion"

By H. E. HOLLAND, M.P.

Mrs. Ballantyne asked for an assurance
that the lads would not be subjected to
persecution during the voyage to England.
Sir James Allen replied that they would
be subjected to no persecution whatever.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



3 1822 02466 4732

7-12 105 345

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY

THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS
of New Zealand and "The Process
of their Conversion"

By H. E. HOLLAND, M.P.



WELLINGTON, N. N. Z.

PRINTED BY THE MAORI AND WORKER PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO. LTD.
AND PUBLISHED BY H. E. HOLLAND, 227 HART VALLEY ROAD, BROOKLYN

1919

THE C.O's.

Their names are writ in every Clink—
This small but steadfast band
Who for themselves have dared to think
And firmly take their stand.

The tyrants' boast to crush and kill
And this proud spirit bend
Does only strengthen each man's will
To conquer in the end.

Although to-night in prison cell
'Neath Mammon's lock and key,
It only holds the earthly shell—
The mind and soul are free.

The Brotherhood of Man's their aim ;
So come whate'er betide
They'll bear it all in Freedom's name,
Their conscience is their guide.

Though each should fill a Martyr's grave,
What grander end could be ?
Their death will only help to pave
The road to Liberty.

D. BAXTER.

In Detention,
July 26, 1917.

FOREWORD.

The publication of this book may be said to have a three-fold purpose. It is written to turn the searchlight of publicity on a policy which had we been wise should never have been written into the Statutes of this country; secondly, to make known some of the shocking experiences the men of conscience were called upon to undergo and the terrible price they were required to pay for their crime of holding conscientious objections to military service; and, finally, to make it impossible for such a stupendous wrong to ever again sully the annals of this country with the record of its atrociousness.

To this end I have sought to place the book before the public in advance of the General Election. It is imperative that the electors should know the lengths to which a Government, having clothed itself with military despotism, in arrogant disregard of the wishes of the people, found it possible to go in its determination to translate into practice the theories of the military extremists. This being so, and because the General Election cannot be much longer delayed, the work of compilation has had to be done in great haste and often during intervals snatched from the crowded hours which belong to strenuous campaigning.

I wish to thank Messrs. Brown and Briggs (Palmerston North), the Social Democratic Party (Wellington), the National Peace Council of New Zealand (Christchurch), the Labour Representation Committee, (Gisborne), the Auckland Waterside Workers' Union, Mr. and Mrs. R. W. S. Ballantyne, Messrs. Ronald S. Badger, Burns, Smith, Begg, and Moffit, and other friends for placing sufficient funds at my disposal to cover the cost of publication. I also wish to thank Mr. J. Glover, manager of "The Maoriland Worker" for having turned the work out at little more than the cost of production; the conductor of the Country Worker's Page for advance notices in successive issues; "The Worker" mechanical staff for the manner in which they have cheerfully co-operated in hastening the production of the book, as well as for the excellence of their work; and Mrs. Beck, of the Women's International League, for assistance in compiling lists of imprisoned C.O.'s.

Whatever profits accrue from the sale of this book will be devoted to the fund for providing for the maintenance of the wives and children of imprisoned and victimised Conscientious Objectors.

H.E.H.

TO THE WOMEN
WHO SUFFERED

ARMAGEDDON --- OR CALVARY

I.—INTRODUCTORY.

The war period revealed that there were four types of Conscientious Objectors to Military Service in New Zealand.

On the one hand we had the Religious Objectors, who took much the same view of Military Service as was held by the early Christians. They obstinately persisted in bestowing a literal interpretation on the command of the Galilean Carpenter: "Thou shalt not kill"; and, even as the early Christians were hurled among dreadful serpents, flung into the lions' den, or nailed to the Roman cross, so these latter-day Christians were ready to pay the penalty for their life principles, whether through pitiless years in the gloom of the prison cell or grimly before the guns of the firing party. Stella Benson, in her novel, "This is the End," says: "You must take either Christianity or War seriously—hardly both." The extreme Christians of New Zealand chose to take Christianity seriously, and it was unfortunate for them that our War Legislation forbade literal interpretations of the fundamentals of Christian teaching. Prior to the war there were few indeed who would not have conceded that the anti-war slogan of the Carpenter was a profound morality. The War Regulations, however, made it an offence punishable with a year's jail to propagate the command: "Thou shalt not kill," and it became a matter for the practical Christian of choosing between Christ and the War Regulations.

Different in many ways from the Christian Objectors were the Socialist Objectors; of these there were some thousands. The Christian Objector is always a Pacifist. Sometimes the Socialist is a Pacifist; often he isn't. There are many Socialists who wouldn't fight under any circumstances whatever. Again, the Socialists are legion who—while they would avoid war as long as it could be avoided—would fight to the death in a struggle to liberate mankind from Capitalism. Generally speaking, the Socialist Objector bases his objection on the fact that wars are never made by the workers nor yet in their in-

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

terests, but have their foundations in the quarrels of the national capitalists over markets and for economic supremacy. "The interests of the workers of all countries are identical," said the Socialist Objector; "there is no reason whatever why they should kill one another in their masters' quarrels." And, of course, he immediately found himself up against the Military Service Act and the War Regulations.

Of a different type, again, were the Irish Objectors. Often, of course, the Irishman is a Christian; often he is a Socialist; sometimes he is neither. It is seldom that he is a Pacifist; once in a hundred years you will find a Sheehy Skeffington—and Skeffington was of English descent, anyhow. When, during the recent war, many Irishmen in New Zealand objected to military service, their objection was not based on either a Christian or a Socialist reason; its foundation was historical. They protested that the Irish had never been voluntary, but always compulsory, subjects of England, and that, therefore, they ought not to be required to fight in England's wars. In support of this objection, they called in evidence seven hundred long and terrible years of history—years of oppression and repression, of recurring artificial famine, of overflowing prisons, of cruel evictions numbered by the million, of a country depopulated by misrule. Their history was sound; their case was strong. But the War Regulations reached them notwithstanding.

The Maori Objectors were again of a different type. In some respects the Maori Objector resembled the Irish—with the difference, of course, that the Maori belongs to a different historical period from his white brother. The Maori Objectors came mostly from the Waikato Tribe. They are not Pacifists; from time immemorial they have been a warlike people. The reasons on which their objection was founded are to be found in the history books—particularly Rusden's History.

Of course, every Conscientious Objector did not go to prison—nor yet to the hills. Men with families had bitter reason to know that, if they placed high principle first and chose the prison, those most dear to them in life would suffer hardship and hunger, want and misery. And so, out of their great love for the little children whose bread-winners they were, out of the love they bore the good women whose life-mates they were, they made the supreme sacrifice of principle and went "marching down to Armageddon," heavy-hearted, it is true, but still with the pitiful assurance that whether they lived or whether they died their loved ones would be saved, however miserably, from the ravages of hunger. The others resolutely shouldered the Cross, and, "with the moral courage of a God" (as the Dismissed Dominic has written it), unfalteringly directed their steps towards the gloomy summit of the modern Calvary.

For there was no other alternative. It was either Armageddon or Calvary.

II.—THE COMING OF CONSCRIPTION.

Immediately following the outbreak of war in 1914, Sir James Allen, without consulting either Parliament or the people, hastened to promise to the British military authorities an Expeditionary Force of 8000 men, and to maintain this at full strength for the period of the war. No sooner was this promise made than the people were being sternly reminded that they must "honour their obligations," etc. The first Expeditionary Force numbered 7761, necessitating a monthly reinforcement of 1100 men; and, notwithstanding the almost unthinkable terms offered the volunteers, so great was the response to the call for men that the Main Body was speedily increased by additions from the Reinforcements. As a matter of fact, by the time of the Gallipoli retreat we were supplying reinforcements on a Main Body strength of 14,000 men—nearly double the number originally promised by Sir James Allen. Later this strength rose to 20,000, and still later to considerably more; until we were sending away drafts of from 2200 to 2600 men every four weeks—more than double the original reinforcements. The more thoughtful men now began to recognise that New Zealand was being bled white in the matter of the physically best of its manhood.

The 1914 General Election was fought out in December, when the war fever was at its height, and only here and there the voice of Reason found itself capable of rising above the frenzied din. The election was remarkable for the sham fight staged by the Reform and Liberal Parties; but neither Tory nor Liberal "Patriot" dared to lift a serious voice in advocacy of the imposition of Conscription. The election was no sooner over, however, than the two anti-Labour Parties began to make overtures to each other, and in due time an alliance was entered into, and the National Government was formed.

Following hard on the heels of this event, a section of the press commenced an insidious propaganda in support of Conscription for New Zealand. The best-informed men in the Labour movement had no illusions concerning the idea that was in the minds of the military propagandists. It was fairly clear that the papers wanted Conscription, not so much to defeat the Germans as to defeat the people of New Zealand.

The papers became more and more insistent in their demands, and at last certain minor politicians began to say—somewhat timorously at first, and then more brazenly—that they "would support Conscription if it should be found that we could not otherwise keep our obligations to the Empire."

It was now the task of the capitalist press to "prove" that only by the adoption of Conscription could we honour "our obligations to the Empire"; and this it proceeded to do.

When Labour began to raise its protests against the danger of

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Prussian Militarism being fastened on this country (I had the honour, by the way, of sounding the first warning note in the leading columns of "The Maoriland Worker," of which paper I was then editor), the Tory-Liberal leaders at first denied that they contemplated such a move. A little later we found them saying that they would only resort to Conscription if it was necessary to do so to enable us to "keep our obligations to the Empire." Sir Joseph Ward was indiscreetly frank. He told a Dunedin audience that he knew that Conscription was Prussian Militarism; still, he said, in effect, he "would vote for it if it was necessary to enable us to keep our obligations to the Empire." From this more or less camouflaged attitude to the open declaration that Conscription was necessary to enable us to "honour our promises to the Empire" was but a short step. But both press and anti-Labour politicians smothered up the fact that Sir James Allen's original and unauthorised promise had been kept under Voluntarism with interest at from 100 to 200 per cent.

Swift in the wake of the campaigning for Conscription came the intimation that a "National Register" of the country's manhood was to be taken. In "The Maoriland Worker" I voiced the protest that this was the first real step towards Conscription. Other men raised similar protests on the public platform. The Labour movement began to awaken—all too late, unfortunately. As the protests poured in, the Government deemed it advisable solemnly to pledge its word to the people that the Register was to be a purely civil census, and would not be used in any way in connection with Conscription. How flagrantly that pledge was dishonoured was demonstrated when the first Conscription ballot was drawn and it was found that the very cards signed by the men for the purposes of the National Register were the cards that were drawn by the girls from the boxes in the Statistician's office when the marble numbers were called. At all subsequent ballots the National Register cards were similarly used.

All men over 19 years of age were required to register; but only from those between 19 and 45 were replies demanded as to their willingness or otherwise to undertake military service. The men of this age who registered numbered 195,341. Of these 33,785 declared that they would not undertake service at home or abroad, while 44,338 were unwilling to undertake service abroad, but stated their willingness to do home service. So that 78,123 men declared against being sent abroad for war service.

The men who expressed themselves willing to undertake military service abroad numbered 119,778. Of these a very substantial majority (61,704) were married men, while 16,876 were single men with dependents. Only 31,103 single men without dependents intimated their willingness to go abroad.

The Register was thus a clear indication that a huge majority of eligible men were against Conscription; for—side by side with the emphatic answer of the single men—there was the hard fact of the

THE COMING OF CONSCRIPTION.

Government's pledge that the Register was not to be used for military purposes, and the further fact that very many married men for obvious reasons replied "Yes," believing that the married men would never be called upon. It was at this time the general opinion that the single men would fill all the gaps.

Presuming on the "Yes" majority—an altogether misleading quantity—the Conscriptionists became more aggressive in their demands; and the Labour movement replied with the great Anti-Conscription Conference of January, 1916, at which 200 organisations were represented, and which, with one dissentient only, denounced Conscription. From this Conference was issued the memorable Anti-Conscription Manifesto, which extracted a wild scream from every profiteering interest, agent, and political lackey in the land. The Manifesto demanded the highest trade union wages for the soldiers and the commandeering of all incomes over a soldier's wage. This to ensure a semblance of "equality of sacrifice" on the part of the wealthy. A. S. Neill, the gifted author of "A Dominie Dismissed," once met a titled lady and discussed war matters with her. After she had gone he was asked what he thought of the English aristocracy, and gave his opinion in these words: "To the English aristocracy property alone is sacred. That woman has given the lives of her two sons willingly for her country, but if she were asked to give half-an-acre of her estate to help pay for the war she would go mad with rage and disgust." Captain Donald Simpson said something similar about certain profiteers in New Zealand. The thunderburst of rage and disgust which greeted the proposal of the Labour Conference to take the money of the wealthy (for whose property interests the soldiers were fighting) for war purposes left the marks of its forked lightning flame scorched black in the columns of the yellow press and burnt deep in the memories of the audiences who listened while certain anti-Christian religionists among the politicians raved on select and secluded platforms.

While the Labour Conference was discussing ways and means of saving New Zealand from the iron grip of Prussian Militarism, Mr. W. M. Hughes and Mr. W. F. Massey were meeting secretly at Auckland—undoubtedly for the purpose of discussing the application of Conscription to the Commonwealth and the Dominion. Mr. Hughes had adopted a not very courageous method of getting away from Australia. He had caused it to be known that he purposed sailing for London by a boat due to leave Melbourne. He had organised a send-off for himself at Sydney station, and had steamed outward and southward to the stage-managed cheers of his official admirers. He had gone a few miles out of Sydney, and had then left the train, and, returning to the metropolis, had been taken in a launch to the Auckland boat lying in the stream, leaving the Germans to believe he was sailing from Melbourne, and consequently leaving the Melbourne boat to be regarded as lawful prey by the submarines if they really wished to

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

get Mr. Hughes—a matter about which I have my own doubts. At Auckland, as I have indicated, Mr. Hughes was secretly met by Mr. Massey. The Censorship was employed to prevent the people of this country from knowing that Mr. Hughes was here or that he and Mr. Massey were conferring. The following telegram, dated January 22, 1916, was sent to the editors of the various papers:—

“The Hon. Mr. W. M. Hughes, Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, is arriving in New Zealand shortly. You are strictly prohibited from making any mention, reference, or allusion to this fact or to his movements whilst in the Dominion or to his departure therefrom.—C. H. GIBBON, Colonel, Chief of the General Staff, and Military Authority under the War Regulations Act.”

After his meeting with Mr. Massey—a conference which, no doubt, had to do with the subsequent military history of this country—the Australian Prime Minister sailed for London, where to the British Militarists he duly pledged the country he nominally represented to adopt Conscription. On the strength of his military policy he was lionised in certain quarters and actually taken seriously. But his stock fell when he failed on his return to Australia to make good in the matter of his rash promises. Happily for the cause of human freedom, however unhappily for Mr. Hughes, his own party promptly dealt with him for his apostasy, repudiated his pledge for the Prussianising of Australia, compelled him to submit the matter of Conscription to a vote of the people (by whom it was twice decisively rejected), and eventually hurled him in disgrace and political dishonour from their ranks, and left him hissing and spitting vituperatively from the outer darkness at the working men he had successfully duped for over twenty years.

III.—THE DIVISION LISTS.

Mr. Massey and Sir Joseph Ward, for their part, were taking no chances in the matter of trusting the people to decide the question of Conscription or No Conscription. They led a supine majority in Parliament, a majority that moved obediently at every crack of the two-thonged whip. And so, on May 31, 1916, the Conscription Bill (labelled the Military Service Bill) was introduced, and sledge-hammered through Parliament, carrying in its final stage with only five dissentients.

Consistently the Parliamentary Labour Party, consisting of only four men, fought the measure through all its stages. In this fight alone the Labour Party justified its political existence. On every division the four Labour men voted the right way.

THE DIVISION LISTS.

The vote on the second reading of the Bill was reached on June 1, and 47 members voted with the Ayes, and five with the Noes, while four members paired.

The members voting for Conscription were:—Allen, Anderson, Anstey, Buddo, Buick, Craigie, J. M. Dickson, J. S. Dickson, Ell, T. A. H. Field, W. H. Field, Forbes, Fraser, Guthrie, Harris, Herries, Hornsby, Hudson, Isitt, Jennings, MacDonald, McNab, Mander, Massey, Myers, A. K. Newman, E. Newman, Ngata, Nosworthy, Okey, Pearce, Pomare, Poole, R. H. Rhodes, T. W. Rhodes, Russell, Scott, Smith, Statham, W. Stewart, Sykes, Talbot, Veitch, Witty, Wright, Wilford, Young.

The members who voted against Conscription were:—HINDMARSH, McCOMBS, WALKER, WEBB, Payne.

McCallum and Sidey paired with the Ayes, and Thacker and Fletcher with the Noes.

The House went into Committee, and on June 6 a division was taken on the question of forcing boys of 20 to the trenches, and resulted:—AYES: Allen, Anderson, Anstey, Craigie, J. M. Dickson, J. S. Dickson, Fraser, Guthrie, Hanan, Harris, Henare, Herdman, Herries, Hornsby, Hudson, Hunter, Jennings, MacDonald, McNab, Malcolm, Mander, Massey, Myers, A. K. Newman, E. Newman, Ngata, Nosworthy, Okey, Pomare, Poole, Russell, Scott, Sidey, Statham, W. Stewart, Sykes, Talbot, Veitch, Wilkinson, Wright, Young. NOES: Colvin, Ell, T. A. H. Field, W. H. Field, Fletcher, McCallum, McCOMBS, Payne, Poland, T. W. Rhodes, Smith, WALKER, WEBB, Wilford, Witty. Ward paired with the Ayes, and HINDMARSH with the Noes. The Ayes numbered 41—or just one more than half the strength of the House.

On June 6 a motion was tabled in favour of raising the military age to 55. Against this the Government made a resolute stand. The voting resulted:—AYES: Anderson, Colvin, Ell, T. A. H. Field, McCallum, McCOMBS, McNab, Payne, Poland, Smith, WALKER, WEBB, Wilford. NOES: Allen, Anstey, Craigie, J. M. Dickson, J. S. Dickson, W. H. Field, Fletcher, Fraser, Guthrie, Hanan, Harris, Henare, Herdman, Herries, Hornsby, Hudson, Hunter, Isitt, MacDonald, Mander, Massey, Myers, A. K. Newman, E. Newman, Ngata, Nosworthy, Okey, Pomare, Poole, T. W. Rhodes, Russell, Scott, Sidey, Statham, W. Stewart, Sykes, Veitch, Wilkinson, Witty, Wright, Young. HINDMARSH paired with the Ayes, and Ward with the Noes.

On the same date it was resolved, by 43 votes to 9, to place unmarried men with dependents in the First Division, the four Labour men voting with the minority, and Veitch, the Wanganui "independent," with the majority.

On June 7 the House divided on the question of exempting Religious Objectors. The division list stands:—AYES: Allen, J. M. Dickson, Ell, T. A. H. Field, Guthrie, Hanan, HINDMARSH, Isitt, Jennings, McCOMBS, Massey, Okey, Payne, Poland, Poole, Talbot, WALKER, WEBB, Wilkinson, Witty, Wright. NOES: Anderson, Anstey, Craigie,

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

W. H. Field, Fletcher, Fraser, Harris, Herdman, Herries, Hornsby, Hudson, Hunter, MacDonald, Mander, McNab, Myers, A. K. Newman, E. Newman, Nosworthy, Pomare, R. H. Rhodes, T. W. Rhodes, Russell, Scott, Smith, W. Stewart, Sykes, Veitch, Young. On this occasion, only 50 members, out of a House of 80, voted; and it stands on record that the refusal to recognise the Religious Objector was carried by only 29 members—a fraction more than a third of the House. Many members appear to have deliberately absented themselves.

On the same date the clause in the Bill which provided up to five years' jail with hard labour (in addition to liability under the Army Act) for Conscientious Objectors and military defaulters was voted upon. The list:—AYES: Allen, Anderson, Anstey, Brown, Buick, Craigie, J. M. Dickson, J. S. Dickson, Ell, T. A. H. Field, W. H. Field, Fraser, Guthrie, Hanan, Harris, Henare, Herdman, Herries, Hornsby, Hudson, Hunter, Isitt, Jennings, MacDonald, McNab, Mander, Massey, Myers, A. K. Newman, E. Newman, Nosworthy, Okey, Pomare, Poole, R. H. Rhodes, T. W. Rhodes, Russell, Scott, Sidey, Smith, Statham, W. Stewart, Talbot, Veitch, Wilford, Wilkinson, Witty, Wright, Young. NOES: Fletcher, HINDMARSH, McCOMBS, Payne, Poland, WEBB. Ward paired with the Ayes, and WALKER with the Noes.

On June 8 the House divided on the clause providing for fine and imprisonment for employers retaining in their employ Conscientious Objectors. The list:—AYES: Allen, Anstey, Bollard, Brown, Buick, Craigie, Dickie, J. M. Dickson, W. H. Field, Fraser, Forbes, Guthrie, Hanan, Harris, Henare, Herdman, Herries, Hornsby, Hudson, Hunter, McCallum, MacDonald, McNab, Mander, Massey, Myers, A. K. Newman, E. Newman, Nosworthy, Okey, Pearce, Pomare, R. H. Rhodes, T. W. Rhodes, Russell, Scott, Sidey, Smith, Statham, W. Stewart, Sykes, Talbot, Thacker, Veitch, Ward, Wilford, Wilkinson, Witty, Wright, Young. NOES: Colvin, Ell, Fletcher, HINDMARSH, Isitt, Jennings, McCOMBS, Payne, Poland, Poole, WALKER, WEBB.

On the same date the House again divided on the clause which gave the police power to question and arrest without warrant men of military age. The list:—AYES: Allen, Anstey, Bollard, Buick, Craigie, J. M. Dickson, Ell, T. A. H. Field, W. H. Field, Forbes, Fraser, Guthrie, Hanan, Harris, Henare, Herdman, Herries, Hornsby, Hunter, Isitt, Jennings, MacDonald, McNab, Mander, Massey, Myers, E. Newman, Nosworthy, Okey, Pearce, Pomare, R. H. Rhodes, T. W. Rhodes, Russell, Scott, Sidey, Smith, Statham, W. Stewart, Sykes, Talbot, Thacker, Veitch, Wilkinson, Witty, Wright, Young. NOES: Fletcher, HINDMARSH, McCOMBS, A. K. Newman, Payne, Poland, Poole, WALKER. Ward paired with the Ayes, and WEBB with the Noes.

On the same date yet another division was taken on a clause which provided a fine of £50 for persons knowing the whereabouts of Conscientious Objectors and military defaulters and failing to inform. The four Labour men, one independent, and one Liberal voted or paired against the proposal, and 45 members (including Veitch) voted with the Ayes.

THE DIVISION LISTS.

On the same date the House was divided on the clause giving Cabinet power to end the voluntary system of enlistment by proclamation. Forty-five members (including Veitch) voted and two paired with the Ayes. The four Labour members, one independent, and one Liberal either voted or paired with the Noes.

The third reading of the Bill was taken on June 9—the Government was determined to lose no time in militarising the country—and the list showed:—AYES: Allen, Bollard, Buick, Colvin, Dickie, Ell, T. A. H. Field, W. H. Field, Forbes, Fraser, Guthrie, Hanan, Herdman, Herries, Hornsby, Hudson, Jennings, McCallum, MacDonald, McNab, Malcolm, Mander, Massey, Myers, A. K. Newman, Nosworthy, Pomare, Poole, R. H. Rhodes, T. W. Rhodes, Russell, Scott, Sidey, Smith, W. Stewart, Sykes, Talbot, Thacker, Veitch, Wilford, Wilkinson, Witty, Wright, Young. NOES: Fletcher, McCOMBS, Payne, WEBB. E. Newman and Ward paired with the Ayes, and HINDMARSH and WALKER with the Noes.

It should be noted that Thacker, who had voted against the second reading, changed his mind and voted for the third reading.

By the end of July, the unpopularity of the Government's action, supported by Parliament, was abundantly manifest; and on August 4 the House was divided on the question of extending its own life—in other words, the proposal was to disfranchise the whole of the electors of New Zealand until December, 1918. It appeared to the Labour Movement that this step was deliberately taken to ensure that the people should have no opportunity of dealing with the men who had so grossly betrayed them. For this amazing proposal, 41 members (one more than half the strength of the House) voted. Nineteen members who were not out of New Zealand absented themselves. The division list:—AYES: Anderson, Allen, Bollard, Buddo, Buick, J. M. Dickson, J. S. Dickson, Ell, W. H. Field, Fraser, Glover, Guthrie, Hanan, Harris, Henare, Herdman, Herries, Hudson, Hunter, Isitt, Jennings, MacDonald, McNab, Malcolm, Mander, Massey, Myers, E. Newman, Nosworthy, Okey, Poland, Pomare, R. H. Rhodes, Russell, Scott, Statham, Stewart, Sykes, Thomson, Ward, Young. NOES: Anstey, Craigie, T. A. H. Field, Fletcher, HINDMARSH, McCOMBS, A. K. Newman, Payne, T. W. Rhodes, Talbot, Veitch, WALKER, WEBB, Wilford, Witty, Wright.

In the April session of 1918, the House again extended its own life—i.e., disfranchised the whole of the electors—for a further period of a year: until the end of 1919. So the Parliamentarians who imposed Prussian Militarism on the people took good care that the outraged people should be deprived of all means of constitutional redress. It is for the people to pronounce on this line of conduct at the forthcoming general election.

IV.—THE FLOOD-TIDE OF REPRESSION.

No sooner was the campaign for Conscription seriously entered upon than the large halls, principally in the metropolis, were closed against the Labour Movement. Even the Wellington Town Hall was refused for the purpose of holding a public meeting under the auspices of the Labour Party to discuss the proposal. The proprietors of a local theatre tore up their agreement with the Social Democratic Party; and when the people filled the Alexandria Hall to overflowing and hundreds clamoured outside for Anti-Conscriptionist speakers to address them, the speakers—Mr. P. C. Webb, M.P., Miss Adela Pankhurst, and the author—were prosecuted and penalised on a charge of "obstructing the traffic," notwithstanding that Abel-Smith Street on Sunday evening is positively devoid of traffic. On the same day, Mr. W. F. Massey addressed a crowd in Cuba Street—one of the city's busiest thoroughfares; but the class line was drawn far too rigidly to permit of any prosecution in his case.

The repressive War Regulations multiplied with the enactment of Conscription. Detectives were told off to follow up Labour meetings, and in due time Hansard reporters were sent to take verbatim reports of Labour speeches. When in December, 1916, the second great Anti-Conscription Conference, representing 50,000 workers, was sitting, detectives appeared with orders to demand admittance—a demand which was, however, not complied with. Mr. Peter Fraser (now M.P. for Wellington Central), secretary of the Conference, was arrested while Conference was sitting; and the arrests of Messrs. Brindle, Armstrong, and a number of others followed in rapid succession. Messrs. Semple and Cooke had been arrested a few days earlier. Almost half the effective platform propagandists of the Labour Movement were placed behind prison bars. Then the pursuit of the men who voiced Labour sentiments became still more determined. For months, at every meeting I addressed—it did not matter what the subject was—a "Hansard" stenographer took a verbatim report at the press table, while a detective took notes in the body of the hall (apparently for the purpose of checking the shorthand reporter's notes), while two or three other detectives were also in the body of the hall.

A system of far-reaching espionage became part of the official programme. The letters of the Government's principal anti-militarist opponents were subjected to a censorship intended to be secret, but so clumsily carried out that it told its own tale. For considerably more than a year every letter which came to myself, whether addressed to my home or office, was opened and read and then re-closed neither neatly nor with regard for method or cleanliness. My letters were held up for periods which ranged from three days to a month. Letters to my wife from our sons in Australia were sub-

THE FLOOD-TIDE OF REPRESSION.

jected to the same scrutiny. Even the Christmas cards which came addressed to our children did not escape. This was not my experience alone. It was the experience of every person prominent in the Labour movement, the Peace Council, the Freedom League, the Women's League, and other organisations whose work menaced the interests of the Prussianists and the Profiteers. Of course, it was inevitable that in due time intelligence methods would be developed within the Labour movement which would render the system of espionage largely ineffective.

About this time two determined attempts were made from within to induce Cabinet, by War Regulation, to make it an act of sedition to advocate the Parliamentary repeal of Conscription. Fortunately for New Zealand—perhaps, also, for the Prussian-minded men responsible for the proposal—the infamous attempt against Constitutionalism was not agreed to by Cabinet.

Early in 1917 there came the first miners' go-slow strike, constituting an effort to secure a 17½ per cent. wages increase to enable the miners to meet, to some small extent, the enormous increase in the cost of living, which increase was largely the direct outcome of war profiteering. The Miners' Executive members were dragged away to jail, and a new Executive came into office; whereupon the rank and file, going over the heads of the Executive, declared a strike against Conscription. The strike was eventually called off as the result of a bargain between the Acting-Prime Minister and the Minister of Mines on the one hand and the Miners' Federation on the other hand, practically guaranteeing that the miners would not be conscripted for the army, and that the men concerned in the strike would not be prosecuted. Needless to say, the terms of the bargain were not honoured in their entirety, for the ink was scarcely dry on the signatures when Messrs. O'Brien and O'Rourke were arrested and sent to jail.

As a result of the strike, Mr. P. C. Webb, M.P. for Grey, was arrested on May Day of 1917, held without bail, and at last sentenced to three months' jail. On his release he was accorded a reception by thousands of citizens of Grey, Westland, and Buller, which lives as the greatest event in the history of the West Coast.

V.—SIDE-STEPPING THE LAW.

Parliament first of all emphatically refused to exempt the Conscientious Objector, as the Division List of June 7, 1916, shows. Then, for a reason yet to be explained, Parliament changed its extraordinary mind, and proceeded to make provision for the exemption from combatant service of men who could prove that, prior to August 4, 1914, they belonged to a religious organisation opposed to military service.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

When the Bill was sent to the Legislative Council on June 9 it contained the following condition on which a balloted man might secure exemption:—

“That he was on the fourth day of August, 1914, and has since continuously been a member of a religious body the tenets and doctrines of which declare the bearing of arms and the performance of any combatant service to be contrary to divine revelation, and that, according to his own conscientious religious belief, the bearing of arms and the performance of any combatant service is unlawful by reason of being contrary to divine revelation.”

It will be noted that this severely excluded recognition of the individual religious conscience except as the auxiliary of the collective conscience of an organisation. It denied to the Anglican, Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, Salvationist Objector the right of individual conscience. To the Socialist, Irish and Maori Objector it denied the right of either a collective or an individual conscience. It only left the way of exemption on conscientious grounds open to the members of the Society of Friends, Christadelphians, and one or two other small bodies. Even in their cases it was insisted that they must appear for medical examination, attestation, etc. And again, even to these objectors it only gave exemption from “combatant” service; it offered the alternative of “non-combatant” service; and, of course, in a multitude of cases, the extreme religious conscience revolted against any kind of war work.

The printed document to be signed by the Objector set forth that: “I, (Blank), having appealed to a Military Board on the ground of my religious objections to military service, hereby undertake, if my appeal is allowed on that ground, faithfully and willingly to perform such non-combatant work or services as may be required of me in accordance with regulations made under the Military Service Act, 1916, and at such rate of payment as may be prescribed by such regulations.”

On June 7 the House divided on a proposal to deprive the Conscientious Objectors of their citizen rights for a period of ten years, and the proposal was defeated by 33 to 23. The division list:—AYES: Allen, Bollard, Buick, J. M. Dickson, Harris, Henare, Herdman, Herries, Hornsby, Hudson, Mander, Myers, E. Newman, Nosworthy, Okey, Pearce, R. H. Rhodes, T. W. Rhodes, Statham, W. Stewart, Wright Wilkinson, Young. NOES: Anstey, Craigie, Dickie, Ell, T. A. H. Field, W. H. Field, Fletcher, Forbes, Sir W. Fraser, HINDMARSH, Hunter, Isitt, Jennings, McCallum, McCOMBS, MacDonald, McNab, A. K. Newman, Poland, Pomare, Poole, Russell, Scott, Sidey, Smith, Talbot, Thacker, Veitch, WALKER, Ward, WEBB, Wilford, Witty.

By the following session the vast majority of the Tory and Liberal members had somersaulted, and a Bill was carried and sent to the Legislative Council providing for deprivation of citizen rights for the Conscientious Objectors. The Bill, however, also contained a

SIDE-STEPPING THE LAW.

clause providing for the exemption of all clergymen and teachers (including, of course, the Marist Brothers). This clause was rejected by the Council, whereupon the Government dropped the whole measure. The Council's desire to see the Marists conscripted saved the other Objectors in this respect for the time being. By the second session of 1918, as we shall see, the whole of the House, with the exception of the Labour members, had fallen under the influence of the interests antagonistic to the men of conscience.

Now, the rejection by the Council of the clause referred to left the law so that it required that the name of every clergyman and theological student should be placed in the ballot in the order of his Division. The Catholic clergy and teachers, by reason of their celibacy vows, came at once into the First Division; consequently the Catholic Church was the first religious organisation seriously menaced by the Act. It was alleged, however, that the Government had previously pledged itself to the Church that the clergy and the Marist Brothers would not be called up. The "New Zealand Times," when the fact became known, explained that the Government had made this bargain because it was anxious to get Conscription through without being tripped up by the problem of the Conscientious Objector. This pledge was understood to mean that the clergy would not be balloted. When the "system" began to work, however, and Bishop Brodie and quite a number of the clergy and Marist Brothers were duly drawn and required to take their chances before the Appeal Boards, the suspicion arose that another scrap of paper was about to be torn up, and a determined spirit of resistance began to make itself felt.

Plain speaking on the part of influential Catholics was not without its undercurrent of threat. Archbishop O'Shea laid it down that while a priest would cheerfully expose his life at the call of duty, "to put a rifle in his hand and require him to take the life of another would be an outrage on the sanctity of his profession and an outrage on the Catholic conscience." When he was reminded that in France the priests were compelled to the trenches, he retorted: "Well, the law that compelled the priests to fight in France was passed by an infidel Government for the purpose of destroying the Church." He warned the Government: "Catholics are resenting deeply the attempt to conscript their clergy, and will resent it still more if it is persisted in." He sternly declared: "We will use every means in our power to prevent it." He appealed to the Government "not to persist in a policy that we look upon as a useless persecution and will resent to the end." Father Taylor wrote in the leading daily papers protesting that it was "monstrous" that a layman should declare the clergy "under compulsion to carry arms and dip their hands in the blood of their fellowmen." The chairman of a Catholic public meeting at Wellington denounced the proposal to conscript priests and theological students as "a gross outrage." A prominent Wellington lawyer at the same meeting asked:

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

"Are we going to stand by and see our priests sent to the firing line? I say no. Is there a single male Catholic in the Dominion who will not make any sacrifice to prevent a single priest being sent to the firing line?" The Wellington correspondent of a Christchurch paper intimated that the Catholic clergy had a promise from the Government that the clergy would not be conscripted, and that the Bishops had been lulled by this promise, and so had allowed the legislation to proceed without protest. This correspondent, pointing out that Archbishop O'Shea's words had been addressed to "men and women of Irish blood, who knew something of suffering and had not forgotten," declared that "to them and their offspring there would be no bravado about making a stand to protect the priest."

The Government had sown the wind, and it began to look as if the Church would lay upon it the obligation of reaping the whirlwind. But for a harvesting of this sort the Government had no stomach; and accordingly it planned for a way by which it might escape from an ugly situation. The method it adopted to save itself from the consequences of its own unwise and unjust law was explained by Sir James Allen to a deputation (of "a private character") of representative Methodists and Presbyterians which waited upon him at Christchurch on February 23, 1917. Parliament having refused to exempt the clergy, this end was to be achieved by the Minister of Munitions sending to the Appeal Board in each clerical case a certificate of exemption. All that was necessary was that the heads of the respective churches should make application on behalf of the clergy for whom exemption was desired.

The Cabinet could not have been the happiest family round about this period, for two days later the Hon. G. W. Russell, also deputationised at Christchurch (by the Ministers' Association), said: "He could not give a specific reply to the Association that a secret undertaking existed between the Government and the Church"—meaning the Catholic Church. But the honourable gentleman made it quite clear that he had considerably swerved from his former attitude. On the previous June 6 he had voted against exempting Religious Objectors. On June 7 he had voted in favour of jail with five years' hard labour for Conscientious Objectors. On June 8 he had voted to punish with fine and imprisonment an employer who retained in his employ a Conscientious Objector refusing military service. On June 8 also he had voted in favour of a £50 fine for persons who failed to inform against Conscientious Objectors refusing military service. Now he told the Protestant ministers he was in favour of exempting all clergymen—"he could conceive of nothing more incongruous than that a minister of religion should be compelled to bear arms." It was surely not alone because he once represented Riccarton that his dearest friends nicknamed the present member for Avon.

It may be explained here that the Labour Movement never at any time desired that the clergy of any church or the Marist Bro-

SIDE-STEPPING THE LAW.

thers should be conscripted. Labour stood against Conscription in the first place, and in the second place for the exemption of every man, whether clergyman or layman, with conscientious objections to military service. If a clergyman was an ardent militarist, there could be no logical reason for his desiring exemption. But, of course, all Christians who interpreted Christian principle from the viewpoint of the early Christians were of necessity anti-militarists, and the Labour movement desired that none of these should be required to do violence to their conscience. There was an open way by which the principles of such men might have been respected. But the Government did not take that open way. On the contrary, it sledge-hammered its tyrannical clauses through Parliament, denying the right of a conscience to the individual, and then when it became alarmed at the storm it had raised, it set out to evade its own bad law. And although it saved itself from coming into conflict with the Church over the matter of the clergy, it went on sending scores of good Catholics to jail for the crime of possessing consciences, just as it sent scores of good Socialists, good Protestants, good Quakers, good Irishmen, and others to jail for the same reason.

From the manner in which the Government backed down before the determination of the Catholic Church, the Labour movement has one great lesson to learn: IT IS ORGANISATION THAT COUNTS. The Church had made up its mind that neither its preachers nor its teachers should be sent to the trenches—and they were not sent. But while the Government stood beaten and afraid before the organised strength of the Church, the jail doors were swinging inward day by day for the representatives of Labour. It is organisation that counts.

VI.—BY PATHWAYS OF SORROW.

The law—made by a handful of men in disregard of the will of the people—duly came into operation, bringing a succession of disasters in its trail. The rule of despotism never fails to lower the moral standards and depreciate the essential values. Deception now became a part of the national life; the spy and the informer functioned secretly. Even the Minister of Defence came to the conclusion that it was part of the duty of a Member of Parliament to act the part of informer. From time to time the Government published lists of the “wanted” men, and every list was sent to each Member of Parliament with an accompanying circular signed by the Minister of Defence, which left no doubt in the mind of the M.P. as to what was expected of him. One of these circulars reads:—

“Please find enclosed herewith a pamphlet containing the lists and full particulars of soldiers who have been declared to be deserters

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

from the various training camps, and also lists of the names of missing reservists who have been drawn in the various ballots, for whose arrests warrants are still outstanding and in the hands of the police. I have arranged for these pamphlets and lists to be sent to you each month, as there is every probability that some information might come to your knowledge which would be of assistance to the military authority in tracing these men. Should any information reach you at any time, it would be appreciated if you would communicate the same to the local police or to the military authorities."

Month by month hundreds of unwilling men were forced into camp; month by month hundreds were gazetted as deserters. Month by month numbers were seized or gave themselves up—some of them going into camp and some into prison, when their places in the "Gazette" were filled by other names. It did not matter that a man had never taken the oath, that he had never passed a medical test, that he had positively refused to be a soldier. He was held to have taken the oath; he was categorised as a soldier; he was labelled "deserter," and treated accordingly. Employers were forbidden to give him work; his own mother was liable to jail with three years' hard labour if she gave him shelter; his own friends were liable to fine and imprisonment if, knowing his whereabouts, they failed to inform the authorities.

The boats carried away hundreds of New Zealand's best men—openly, immediately prior to Conscription; secretly after its enactment—to become exiles in distant lands. Thousands became fugitives in their own land. They moved from city to city, from town to town, from district to district.

Hundreds went to the hills, and in the wildness of the mountain forest found a measure of that freedom which had been so ruthlessly destroyed elsewhere. These mountain dwellers, for conscience sake and with a fortitude akin to heroism that will never be understood by their detractors, faced hardships that cannot be chronicled. In the heart of the winter the rigours of the season tested to the limit their almost superhuman powers of endurance. Betimes they lived in dug-outs; and when the torrential rains of July and August came, they were literally flooded out. In the summer months the bush fires swept through the mountains and drove them from refuge to refuge. While their fellows were being hunted down in the towns by the detectives, they were being tracked through the hills by the uniformed police and menaced by the would-be informer.

Of necessity, sorrow and suffering—the ripe fruit of this national wrong-doing—came into the lives of a multitude of people, desolation and despair into a multitude of homes. The wives and mothers suffered most. In war-time it is ever the mother heart that breaks. Nor did the children escape; they were made to pay the bitter price of want and destitution.

The story will never be adequately written of the brave women

BY PATHWAYS OF SORROW.

who cheerfully faced penury, who, with a love that was divine, left the little homes that had been won through long years of sacrifice and went to work—as teachers, as nurses, as factory workers, as waitresses, as domestic servants, as charwomen—to provide for their children when the men were deprived of the opportunity of working for them; of how they struggled through the weary months and desperate years while the men they honoured were wandering in exile or languishing in prison. Wide and varied, tragic and terrible, were some of their experiences.

For more than two years my correspondence file contained, in the form of a multitude of letters, different phases of the story of the nation's heartbreak, particularly the record of the agony of the mothers and wives. For it is one of the wide glories of the Labour movement that all who are weary and heavy laden come to us with their burden of sorrow. During the intolerable sloth of what appeared to be interminable months, there was seldom a week that some wife or mother, some sister or sweetheart, did not come to me with breaking heart and streaming eyes to tell the story of the broken hope of her life.

A wife whose husband was a C.O. in refuge, awoke on different occasions round about midnight to find a plain-clothes police officer on her verandah, moving stealthily, and evidently intent on discovering whether the husband was home.

The mother of a C.O. was taken ill and died. The C.O. (who was sheltering in the bush) arranged that a friend should visit his home and perform certain rites in his behalf. As the friend entered the gate of the residence where the dead woman lay, he was suddenly seized by the police, who had planned an ambush anticipating that the son would come back to take a last sad farewell of all that was mortal of the mother who bore him.

VII.—DEPORTED BY NIGHT.

From the first application of the Conscription law to the middle of 1917 a steady stream of victims poured first into the detention barracks and thence to the prisons. The first sentence was generally 28 days' detention, followed by 84 days in the civil prison. Later this was extended to 111 days, and still later to 11 months or one year. When it was found that deportation would not break the C.O., an almost uniform sentence of two years' hard labour was inflicted. One C.O. tried by Court-martial in the early part of 1918, when asked to plead, retorted: "What is the use of my pleading when my sentence has already been determined?" "How do you know that?" demanded the President of the Court. "I know it, anyhow," replied the prisoner.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

"If you know it, then, what is the sentence?" asked the President. "Why, two years," said the prisoner. "How do you know?" again asked the President. "We have power to award either a heavier sentence or a lighter sentence than that." "I know you have the power," said the prisoner; "but in your own mind you know that my sentence is two years." The C.O. was found guilty and remanded for sentence. When the sentence was promulgated it was found that he had been correct—his term was two years' hard labour. Then, suddenly, New Zealand was shocked into vigorous protest by the deportation of fourteen Conscientious Objectors.

On July 15, Mrs. Ballantyne received a hurriedly-scribbled note from her son, Garth (who had been sentenced some time previously and was serving his sentence in the civil prison at Mt. Cook). He had pencilled this note on board ship, and it had been got ashore surreptitiously. The message read:—

"The undermentioned Conscientious and Religious Objectors were forcibly put on board the transport Waitemata on July 13 and 14:—

"JOHN BAXTER, ARCHIBALD McCOLL LEARMONT BAXTER, ALEXANDER BAXTER, Brighton, Otago.

"WILLIAM LITTLE, Hikurangi, Whangarei, via Auckland.

"MARK BRIGGS, Box 285, Palmerston North.

"FRED ADIN, Patrick Street, Foxton.

"L. PENWRIGHT, Geeverton, Tasmania.

"HARRY PATTON,, North Beach, Cobden, Greymouth.

"ALBERT ERNEST SANDERSON, Babylon, North Wairoa, Auckland.

"GARTH CARSLY BALLANTYNE, 53 Bidwell Street, Wellington.

"DAVID ROBERT GREY, Lowcliffe, Hinds, Canterbury.

"DANIEL MAGUIRE, c/o P. Higgins, Foxton.

"L. J. KIRWAN, Sewell Street, Hokitika.

"THOMAS PERCY HARLAND, 15 Lawson Street, Roslyn, Dunedin.

"All well, in good spirits, and determined to stick out to the end."

Up to this time the public of New Zealand had had no inkling of the Government's intention violently to take from these shores the men who were conscientiously opposed to military service. The parents and other relatives of the fourteen men so taken were not notified that their sons were to be taken away, and, consequently, the mothers particularly were shocked and almost prostrated with grief when they learned that their sons had been dragged away by night and forcibly placed on the transport. Those of us whose task it was to break the news to some of the mothers would never wish to undergo another similar experience.

DEPORTED BY NIGHT.

On the Wednesday following the deportations the mother of one C.O. came to me at "The Worker" office. She had three sons, all of whom were Conscientious Objectors. The whole three had been called up under Section 35, and two of them had gone to prison—one for 28 days and one for 84 days, while the third had just given himself up to the military authorities. On the Tuesday evening the mother had come to Wellington for the purpose of visiting her sons on the following day. On the Wednesday morning, however, she heard that some Conscientious Objectors had been forcibly deported; and, hastening to "The Worker" office with fear in her heart, she learned that one of her boys was among them. She had received no intimation that her son was to be taken away, and she was given no opportunity whatever of seeing him before he left. Her tears fell like rain, and the sobs that welled from the depths of her broken mother's heart proclaimed the magnitude of her hurt. Search all the long history of the ages, and you will find nothing more tragic than the spectacle of that bereaved mother—the light gone out of the years of her life—bowed down beneath the burden of sorrow endured by the mothers of the world through all the centuries of sin and suffering that stretch from the foot of Calvary's Cross to the gangway of a Twentieth Century Transport. To me it was as if the Mother of God stood there uplifting a protest to Heaven against the crucifixion of Humanity, and levelling an accusation against myself and all the rest of New Zealand for the Wrong we had made possible.

A few days later the father of another of the men came from the North, only to learn that his son had been forcibly taken away. He was destined never to see his boy again.

Other fathers and mothers were left to discover for themselves that their sons had been transported without even the sorry consolation of bidding them farewell.

VIII.—HISTORIC PROTEST.

On the morning of July 15, Mr. Montgomerie Ballantyne (now deceased) came to me in haste with the news that his brother and thirteen other C.O's. had been forcibly taken from New Zealand in the Waitemata. After a hurried consultation, we decided that the most effective method of letting the public know the evil thing which had been done would be by deputation of protest to the Minister. Swiftly the messages were sent, and as swiftly came the response. There was no man or woman of responsible position in the Labour movement who was not ready to voice the intense indignation of organised Labour at the injustice which had been perpetrated. Indeed, to say that the indignation was intense is to put it mildly. Mr. McCombs,

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

M.P., happened to be in Wellington, and to him was entrusted the task of arranging the deputation, which was received by Sir James Allen (Minister of Defence) on Tuesday morning, July 17.

The report which follows was taken for and appeared in "The Worker."

The deputation included Mrs. R. W. S. Ballantyne (mother of one of the lads deported), Mrs. S. Snow (secretary Housewives' Union), Mrs. S. Beck (president Wellington S.D.P.), Mrs. Aitken, and Mrs. Wesley (Women's International League), Messrs. J. McCombs, M.P., J. Read (president Wellington Trades and Labour Council), G. L. Glover and J. Roberts (president and secretary respectively Waterside Workers' Federation), C. Grayndler (general secretary A.P.U.), H. Tunnicliffe (Palmerston North L.R.C.), H. E. Holland (executive member New Zealand Labour Party), R. W. S. Ballantyne, W. Barr, and other representative men and women.

Mr. McCombs, in introducing the deputation, said that while it was large and representative, the men and women comprising it had been called together at urgent notice, and, had time permitted, many others who were opposed to the forcible deportation of Conscientious Objectors would have been there also. He knew the deputation would have the sympathy of the Minister, for he remembered that when the Conscription Bill was before Parliament, Sir James had endeavoured to make the law better than it was for the conscientious objector. Within the short period that had elapsed since the deportations were known, a number of people had expressed their indignation to him personally, and that feeling was widespread. He read two extracts from the "Christian Commonwealth" showing that some time back the British Government had sent 34 conscientious objectors over to France, and when they still persisted in refusing military service, had court-martialled them, and sentenced them to death; but the death sentence was immediately commuted, and the men returned to England and put in prison. The British Government did not now send conscientious objectors to the trenches; and the deputation sought information concerning the objectors taken from New Zealand.

Mr. J. Read said he was firmly convinced that no military purpose would come out of the act of the Government in shipping these men away against their will. These men objected to fighting, and surely the Government was not sending them away with the intention that they should be shot in the trenches without lifting an arm in defence. If the Government were not contemplating this, then the men would become a burden on the military authorities. He raised his voice against the action.

Mrs. Ballantyne said she was the only mother present of the boys who had been forced upon a transport, and she demanded from Sir James Allen the information where her boy was being sent to. She had seen him last Sunday week, and he had told her there was then

HISTORIC PROTEST

no fear that he would be forcibly put on a transport. She was given no opportunity of seeing him again after he had been shipped. Her son had repeatedly told her on no condition would he take part in military service. She was sorry for the other mothers who had been debarred from seeing their sons before they were hurried away. Her boy was only 21 years of age, and was in delicate health. He had had a college education, and was a good, steady boy, and yet he had been put in jail alongside of men who were serving long sentences for crime. It was shameful to think of, and it was an outrage that the boys should be taken away by force without their mothers even knowing that they were going.

Mrs. Wesley spoke for those mothers who had not the opportunity of seeing their sons before they were deported. She herself had three sons at the front. They had gone voluntarily, but not with her consent; but she felt sure they would never have gone had they known that later men's liberties would be taken from them because they had religious and Socialist objections to military service. They left these shores thinking they were going to fight for freedom, and what freedom had they left behind? Since her boys had gone freedom in New Zealand had ceased to be. She was confident the lads carried away from New Zealand would never surrender their principles.

Mr. J. Roberts said he spoke for the industrial workers, and he asserted that from one end of the country to the other industrial workers were opposed to men being taken 12,000 miles away against their wills for military purposes. The Government was putting itself up against a serious problem; it seemed to be forcing a crisis, for when other industrialists saw their comrades put on board a transport at the point of the bayonet it was likely to engender trouble.

A voice: "It's Prussianism."

Mr. Roberts, continuing, said the Government would be well advised to bring these men back, for the pride of conscience was the greatest gift man possessed. If he were one of the men he would keep on objecting all the time. People might call them shirkers, but he knew one or two of them who had told him they had decided they would not fight under any consideration, as they were opposed to military service. It might mean death for them, and thus they could not be called cowards. He thought the Government should act immediately, and have these men returned to New Zealand.

Mr. Holland said he represented the political side of the Labour movement. The first question he desired to ask the Minister on behalf of both the movement and the relatives of these conscientious objectors was: How many men were placed on board the transports, and what were their names? He asked for definite information on this matter. The deputation knew that some men had been forcibly placed on two transports—one lot on a certain date (named), and they had heard that another lot had been taken on a subsequent date; and they also desired to know what was going to be done when these

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

men reached England. He was personally acquainted with most of the men who had been subjected to compulsory transportation. These men had repeatedly stated that they were opposed to military service, and no matter what the consequences were, he was certain they would never do violence to their consciences. It seemed to him that men and women in New Zealand had no legal right to a conscience. He asked were these men, who had conscientious objections, going to be forced into the trenches. If so, it was certain they would be shot rather than bear arms. What military purpose was to be served, he asked, by dragging this handful of men away from New Zealand. Already they had in England more conscientious objectors than they knew what to do with. In Dartmoor there were 3000 objectors, and over 600 in Wormwood Scrubs, while in all there must be quite 5000 of them in Britain. As far as he knew, there were more soldiers looking after these men than there were conscientious objectors, so that the pursuit of the conscientious objectors was not to be commended even from a military viewpoint. The men forcibly deported were of irreproachable character, and it could not be charged against them that they were cowards; for it required far more courage to take the stand they were taking than to go into camp. Some of these men and boys were Socialist objectors, some were religious objectors, and some objected for other reasons. The Minister would know that during the first three centuries of the Christian era no Christian would be a soldier, and men—and women, too—endured appalling tortures and were flung to the lions and heroically faced death rather than surrender their principles. There was very little applied Christianity to-day; if the Churches were all Christian churches they would all stand for peace and against war. The spirit that actuated the conscientious objectors of to-day was the spirit that inspired the early Christians, and it was not good that the spirit of Diocletian should be let loose against them. Most of those forcibly placed on the transports were mere boys, and to drag them from prison was bad enough, to forcibly carry them on board and make them a public spectacle was bad enough, but it was the acme of inhumanity and cruelty to take them secretly from these shores and not allow their mothers to see them or even know they were going. After referring to the Socialist conscientious objectors, Mr. Holland drew the Minister's attention to the case of the Cody brothers—of whom there were five, and who had all been called up under section 35, and who were apparently pursued by a number of persons, some of whom were undoubtedly actuated by a desire to secure the land the Codys held rather than by motives of genuine patriotism.

Sir James Allen: "That statement is not true. I utterly repudiate it."

Mr. Holland said the march of events would show he was right. He proceeded to refer to the fact that three of the Codys had been ordered into camp, and when they refused the remaining two were

HISTORIC PROTEST.

again called before the Board, and ordered into camp, leaving no one to look after the farms, and their father lying on a dying bed. The last two brothers had since been arrested, and were now in custody, while the other three had disappeared.

Sir James: "Do you know where they are?"

Mr. Holland: "I do not; but if I did, I most certainly should not tell you. I am not an informer."

Sir James: "I did not think you would give the information."

Mr. Holland went on to say that it was a fact that men of Irish blood, with a knowledge of Irish history, were conscientiously opposed to taking part in the war.

Sir James: "God bless my soul! Irishmen have been some of the best soldiers of this war. They have enlisted in large numbers."

Mr. Holland: "I concede all that, but—"

Sir James: "Give me an Irish battalion behind me, and I would go anywhere!"

Mr. Holland: "Quite so. I admit the Irish can fight. They proved it last year, when 3000 of them, badly armed, held Dublin against 30,000 trained and fully-equipped British soldiers." There was, however, an historical fact which neither Sir James nor any member of the Cabinet could deny, and that was that the Irish were subjects of Britain by compulsion and not by consent, and when they objected to military service it was for this historical reason. When Irishmen volunteered for military service no injustice was done to anybody; but he submitted the Government ought not to compel Irishmen (or any others, for that matter) to go to the trenches from New Zealand. He had seen it in print that there were now 150,000 British soldiers on duty in Ireland, and even if they dragnetted New Zealand to the last man—First Division and Second Division—they could not get that number of soldiers from here. He went on to say that even if he were a militarist—which he was not, and had never been—he would not dream of taking up the attitude taken up by those responsible for sending the conscientious objectors away. They seemed to forget that the soldiers now being sent away were conscripts and not voluntary soldiers, and that there was widespread dissatisfaction with the Conscript Law. He did not think Cabinet would dare to test the accuracy of that statement by permitting both the soldiers and the people to vote on the question of Conscription.

Sir James Allen said he utterly repudiated the suggestion that the conscripts were not willing soldiers.

Mr. Holland asked Sir James if he would be willing to test his opinion by taking a vote of the men in any of the camps on the question of Conscription. He thought there was a tendency here to copy some of the worst features of Prussian Militarism, and urged that the boys just taken away ought not to be taken to the trenches, where they would be certain to refuse to bear arms, and would consequently be liable to be shot. He wanted to know whether the Government

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

proposed carrying their policy of deportation to its logical conclusion. Would the married men of the Second Division who were conscientious objectors be forcibly taken away also? He reminded Sir James that the National Register cards showed that some 34,000 men of military age said: "No military service whatever," and nearly 80,000 said: "No military service outside of New Zealand."

Sir James Allen: "Some of the men who said that were over military age."

Mr. McCombs and Mr. Holland said that was not so; men over military age did not have to reply as to military service.

Mr. Holland said since then a further change had taken place, and many married men who had answered "Yes" because they believed they would never be called upon, were now of quite a different opinion.

Concluding, Mr. Holland said, on behalf of the mothers and relatives of the men, he again asked the Minister for information as to the number of men transported and where they were being sent. He made a plea that the Minister would take such steps as would prevent such an outrage ever again being inflicted upon men and boys whose crime was that their ideals were loftier than those of their fellow-men.

Sir James Allen, in reply, said he realised what a very difficult problem the case of the conscientious objector to military service constituted. As Mr. McCombs had said, when the Bill was before Parliament he had done his best to put in a clause giving some recognition to the conscientious objector, but Parliament was very decided about it; and it had been very difficult to secure what they had gained, and that was only secured after several conferences with the Legislative Council. What was in the Act was there was the will of the majority in Parliament, and in administering it he had to carry out the will of Parliament. Now, as to religious objectors—

Mrs. Ballantyne: "There are Socialist objectors as well as religious."

Sir James Allen said there was a clause in the Act which provided that if a man objected to all military service, he could be put, by applying, to work on State farms.

Mr. Holland: "The present clause does not meet the case of either the Catholic or the Church of England conscientious objector."

Sir James Allen: "I admit it does not allow for all religious objectors."

Mr. Read: "It applies only to certain sects."

Sir James Allen said that if a man belonged to a religious denomination whose tenets were against military service he was permitted under the Act to do non-combatant service."

Mr. Holland: Which, as the conscientious objector interprets it, means helping some one else to do the killing."

Sir James Allen: "It means saving life, not taking it." Continu-

HISTORIC PROTEST.

ing, Sir James said he could not understand the man who would object to non-combatant service. He had strained the military law as much as possible. The authorities had to be careful that they were not sheltering shirkers under the conscientious objectors' clause—men who had suddenly developed a conscience.

Mr. Holland: "You cannot lay that charge against these men; they have been conscientious objectors all along."

Sir James went on to deal with the case of the Cody brothers, and said the country was at war and in danger. There were five brothers in this family, well-to-do people. Other people in the district had sent their sons to the firing line. The five brothers were called up under section 35 of the Act. Their cases were heard; three of them were ordered into camp, and the Board depended on them to report on the date fixed. Instead of doing so, they had disappeared.

Mr. Holland: "They made it clear they would not go into camp."

Sir James Allen said these men were being searched for by the police, and he could well understand the indignation of the people of the district whose sons had enlisted. He denied that any of the persons responsible for the agitation against the Codys were influenced by motives suggested by Mr. Holland.

A lady member: "The Codys are not the only Irishmen who have conscientious objections."

Sir James Allen: "The three brothers I have referred to are deserters, and when they failed to report, the remaining two were ordered into camp."

Mr. Holland: "In other words, you punished the last two for the sins of the three who failed to appear."

Sir James: "Nothing of the sort. We punished no one."

Coming back to the case of the deported objectors, Sir James said that these men had been sent to England for the purpose of giving them a further chance of doing their duty. It was hoped that different circumstances would induce them to change their minds.

Mr. Holland: "You want them to go back on their life-long principles."

A member: "Trying the third degree on them?"

Sir James said the idea was to give them another chance to accept non-combatant service.

Mr. Holland: "Have these boys been sent away under any arrangement with the Imperial authorities?"

Sir James Allen: "No. We have not communicated with the Imperial authorities at all about the matter."

Mr. Holland: "Then I'm inclined to think you'll hear about it from the Home Government. The authorities there have quite enough conscientious objectors of their own, and they're not likely to take kindly to your attempt to unload your troubles on to them."

Sir James said Mr. Holland had questioned the willingness of the men who were being ballotted. That statement was quite incorrect.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

The men who were now being sent were quite as willing as those who had volunteered. When they got into camp they were as keen on their duty as the other men. It was true, as Mr. Holland had said, that the men now going away were more subdued, but that was because they recognised the responsibility that was on them.

Mrs. Snow: "They are getting less training."

Sir James Allen denied that statement, and said that men sent away before their time had their training finished in England. He added that instructions had been given in the camp that genuine conscientious objectors would be given non-combatant work.

Mrs. Ballantyne asked for an assurance that the lads would not be subjected to persecution during the voyage to England.

Sir James Allen replied that they would be subjected to no persecution whatever.

Mr. Roberts said he had gone through the Military Service Act, and he could see nothing that gave the Government power to deport men who were not soldiers, men who had not taken the oath.

Sir James Allen said these men were New Zealand soldiers under the Act, notwithstanding that they had not taken the oath.

Mr. Holland asked Sir James Allen for a definite statement of what the Government intended to do with these lads. Would it compel them to go into the trenches in France, and if they refused to bear arms there would they be shot? Would Sir James give the deputation an assurance that under no circumstances would these lads be shot for their refusal to surrender their principles?

Sir James: "If I gave you that assurance, you would communicate with them and urge them to hold out."

Mr. Holland: "There is no danger of that. You know your Government opens every letter I receive or send. I want the information for the sake of the mothers of these lads. If the boys are to be shot because of their principles, why not keep them in New Zealand and shoot them here instead of taking them to France?"

Sir James said the Government had no desire to shoot anybody, nor did they wish to deal unjustly with anyone. As he had said, the idea of sending the men to England was to give them another opportunity to accept non-combatant service. If they still refused, he supposed they would be dealt with in the same way as the other conscientious objectors in England.

In reply to Mrs. Ballantyne, Sir James said facilities would be provided for parents to communicate with their sons.

In reply to Mr. Holland, Sir James said he could not see his way to furnish a list of the men sent away, but would see that the relatives of every man sent away was communicated with. He had been surprised to learn from the deputation that the parents had not been notified that their sons were being sent away.

In reply to further questions, the Minister said they had less than 50 conscientious objectors in custody.

HISTORIC PROTEST.

Mr. Holland: "But you have nearly 2000 of them already gazetted as deserters, and I suppose there are 2000 or 3000 more who are not yet gazetted?"

Mr. McCombs, on behalf of the deputation, thanked Sir James Allen, and the deputation withdrew.

IX.—AFTER THE DEPORTATIONS.

For a long period after the Waitemata had sailed, only the merest scraps of information concerning the "shanghaied" men filtered through. It was a time of terrible anxiety and suspense for the mothers and other relatives. Then letters began to come through, most of them from soldiers, and many of them sent surreptitiously, and from these we began to learn in shreds and patches of how the deported men were faring. Garth Ballantyne wrote his mother when nearing Capetown, and this letter brought the first definite news of experiences of the C.O's. up to that stage. Later still came messages from Britain, telling of the almost unbelievable cruelties to which they had been subjected while on the way from Capetown to Plymouth and the equally abominable cruelties inflicted on them while in Sling Camp.

We learned that our Religious and Socialist friends in Britain (who wished to advise the New Zealand C.O's. as to their legal position and rights under English law), had been refused permission to see them, and had been told that "New Zealanders in England are under active service conditions, and are subject to military law." Which meant that the New Zealand military authorities were adopting a different attitude towards the C.O's. from New Zealand than the British military authorities were adopting towards British Objectors. Several deputations waited upon the High Commissioner, at which Brigadier-General Richardson was present; and the reports seem to indicate that the High Commissioner was not permitted to have much voice in the matter. "General Richardson refused point blank to allow any communication with the Objectors by representatives of sympathetic organisations in Great Britain." The civil authority was made to subserve the military authority, and all the time our New Zealand militarists were gibing at the ultra-militarism of Germany. Of course, it is fair to assume that General Richardson had his instructions.

In the meantime, the feeling of resentment against the action of the Government in connection with the deportations was gathering strength. Immediately following the deportations, huge meetings were held in Wellington and other centres, and in nearly every case practically unanimous protests were recorded and demands made for the return of the deported men. The Trade Unions carried innum-

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

able resolutions, the Labour Party branches and Socialist organisations took a similar course, the Women's Leagues, Councils, and Institutes poured in their protests. The C.O. became a topical subject.

The Prime Minister threatened that every man not exempted by the Boards would be sent away. But, in spite of this attitude on the part of Mr. Massey, there was a general idea abroad that the National Government had received a severe reprimand from the Imperial Government for its trouble in deporting the fourteen. On November 21, 1917, it was stated by the Wellington "Dominion"—the principal Government organ—that "the Imperial authorities have no wish to be troubled with men who will not fight," and that the policy of forcing objectors aboard transports had "now been abandoned in favour of imprisonment." This statement strengthened the belief that the Government had been rapped over the knuckles. It must have been felt, however, that the "Dominion" had been guilty of an indiscretion, for a little later a Southern paper (in an evidently inspired report) announced that all the Conscientious Objectors in jail would "have to go the same way as the preliminary draft." In reply to this announcement, I expressed the opinion in print that all that was best in the industrial and political life of New Zealand would indignantly repudiate even the suggestion that any such policy should be pursued.

The February official statement of Sir James Allen contained the following paragraph: "Statements have been made in the press that it is not intended to despatch abroad any more of the soldiers who have been punished for refusing to obey orders. These statements have been made without foundation, and no such decision had been reached." The manner in which this paragraph is worded suggests a heavy camouflage. It had never been stated by anybody that "soldiers who had been punished for refusing to obey orders" would not be sent abroad. The statement was that Conscientious Objectors who refused to be soldiers would not be sent abroad; and this proved to be correct. Sir James's statement could be read in two ways. However, the Government did not dare to send any more C.O.'s. away. If any further attempt had been made in that direction, it is certain that a very serious situation would have arisen in New Zealand. Besides, it is now clear that the Imperial authorities did not want C.O.'s. from here; they had quite enough of their own; and it is just possible that, when some day the correspondence becomes available, it will reveal the measure of the National Government's humiliation.

X.—“ THE BEST PANTOMIME.”

The political appointment of Mr. A. L. Herdman, Attorney-General in the National Government, to a Supreme Court Judgeship necessitated a by-election for Wellington North, to fill the vacancy thus created. This election took place on February 28, 1918. It was my privilege to carry the Labour standard in that memorable conflict, and I determined to make the Government's treatment of the Conscientious Objectors a leading issue in the campaign. Accordingly, in the course of my opening speech in the Town Hall Concert Chamber, Wellington, on February 7, I made this a part of my indictment of the Government. I went fully into the circumstances connected with the deportation of the fourteen men, and dealt also with the treatment of men in detention and prison in New Zealand, challenging the Government to set up a Royal Commission, not a military tribunal, to investigate my charges. The hall was crowded to overflowing, many scores of people having been unable to gain admission; and it was significant that there was no dissentient voice raised against my denunciation of the Government's policy. Among the matters I placed before the electors was the following letter, written to me by a soldier, and dated Featherston, February 3:—

“Sir,—I want to tell you what happened to four Conscientious Objectors who arrived here (Featherston Camp clink) on Thursday last—three days ago. They were not allowed very long to get used to their new surroundings before they were called out and marched off; first, I presume, to the doctor for medical inspection, and then to the Q.M. stores, where, I suppose, an attempt was made to get them to sign for a uniform. This, they told us on returning, had been refused, each of the four standing on his dignity as a Christian and civilian. One of them had refused to submit to a medical examination, and force was resorted to. Again they were not left long in peace before they were ordered out and marched off and subjected to a preliminary trial for refusing to obey a lawful command, etc., and remanded till the following morning, when they were again duly marched off under escort like criminals, and charged before the officer commanding. He considerably gave them a further remand for 24 hours to enable them to consider or reconsider their attitude. This was on Friday; on Saturday they were again marched off and the four were tried together. They were awarded 168 hours' detention, and marched back to the clink. It now seemed that the ‘heads’ had finished their share towards administering the Military Service Act. Shortly after they had been delivered to the sergeant of the guard, an underling in the shape of a n.c.o. came bouncing right into the clink, had them brought before him, and gave them what he called his mind in language which must have been extremely edifying to Christian men. He then told them he had finished with words, and would try what action

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

would do. He told them he was first going to have them medically examined. Three of the men expressed their readiness, and one again objected as a civilian. 'All right,' said the soldier; 'we are going to do it supposing we have to put the handcuffs on,' and off they were marched. They were examined—one by force—and marched back. And now, bow your heads in shame everyone, and read what happened in a military camp in New Zealand. The n.c.o. came in again, called in the sergeant of the guard, who had with him four suits of military dénings or overalls. To each man in turn he offered a suit, and each man in turn refused. The n.c.o. then took out his watch and gave them ten minutes to take off their civilian clothes and don the denims or have it done by force. Needless to say, no notice was taken either of the demins or the threat, but back the n.c.o. came. 'The ten minutes are up,' he said; 'now we'll try action.' He then ordered each man into a close confined cell, bolted the door and locked the bolt—the cells are approximately 8ft. x 6ft., there is a bunk 2ft. wide on one side running the 8ft. way, leaving a floor space of 8ft. x 4ft. The n.c.o. then had three military police brought in, along with three soldiers, men of the guard, and the order was given to open one door at a time and 'strip the b——s.' In the first two instances, the men allowed their clothes to be torn off much as a dead sheep allows its skin to be taken; the third man stood to attention for the first time, and warned the attacking party that he would resist, although he said he intended to hurt no one. The whole six men were employed to strip him, and whilst the struggle was on the n.c.o. stood outside the door and urged them on saying: 'Give the b—— one up if he is such a damned fool, right to the b—— jaw, that'll stop him; frog-march him, one of you sit on his back and another on his head.' After they had stripped him, the gallant n.c.o. asked him how he liked 'action,' and the man's answer was, 'I suppose you are proud of your day's work?' 'Yes,' said the n.c.o.; 'it was the best b—— pantomime I ever saw. There is only one thing I'd enjoy better, and that is to shoot you, you b——, with your back to the wall. I'd do it and feel proud.' His door was then locked, and the inner door dividing the clink proper from the cells was closed in our faces before the fourth door was opened, and our view shut off. I called through the closed wooden partition to the fourth man, who was a Religious Objector: 'Demand a witness, comrade,' but he didn't do so. I heard him say he would not resist, 'but,' he said, 'in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, Who is our Saviour, I forbid you to touch me.' The answer of the n.c.o. to this was: 'We have taken vows' as well as you, and we are obeying orders.' Thus ended this glorious day of militarism. Each man had the suit of denims thrown into him as his civilian clothes were taken away. The men, with one exception, are still in their underpants and shirts; one of them—the one who won't sign anything—is left without a blanket at night; this man also refuses to eat anything while he is close confined. The men are not at all

“THE BEST PANTOMIME.”

down-hearted; they continue to sing their hymns—all joining in. If you can't publish this, for God's sake do something. There were four other witnesses.”

The statements contained in this letter are substantiated by another letter from the “clink” of the same camp on the same date, the writer (the Religious Objector mentioned by the soldier) being one of the founders of the Richmond Mission. Extracts from this Religious Objector's letter were read before the Defence Expenditure Commission to prove the useless expense of such a system. On hearing the extracts read, one of the Commissioners remarked: “You will never make a soldier of that man.”

The soldier's letter to myself is also borne out by the statement of Mr. J. K. Worrall, the C.O. referred to as having been forcibly stripped by six men.

The result of the contest for Wellington North—hitherto a Tory stronghold—staggered the Government. In 1914 the votes cast for the Tory and Liberal candidates represented in the aggregate a majority of more than 4700 over the votes cast for myself as Labour candidate. In 1918 the combined Tory-Liberal majority was only 412. In the three other by-elections which followed in 1918—Grey, Wellington Central and Wellington South—the Government's military policy and its treatment of the Conscientious Objectors was made a fighting issue, and in each case the Government was decisively beaten (with absolute majorities), notwithstanding that the forces of Toryism and Liberalism in each case combined.

Immediately following my opening meeting in the Wellington North campaign, some of my statements were challenged by the Prime Minister in the daily press, and the controversy recorded in the next chapter followed.

XI. A REMARKABLE CONTROVERSY.

Mr. Massey took from the daily press certain statements alleged to have been made by me, and these, together with the Prime Minister's replies, were printed as under:—

1. “Fourteen lads had been sentenced three or four times for the one offence—a gross injustice!”

Reply: “This statement is untrue. No man could be and no man was sentenced more than once for the same offence.”

2. “Some of them were boys of twenty, deported without their mothers knowing where they were going.”

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Reply: "This is also untrue. Seven were 30 years of age and over; one was 27; three were 24; one was 23; two were 22."

3. "They were taken Home in irons."

Reply: "This statement is like the others, but it is a fact that on the voyage some of them would not observe ordinary cleanliness, and as a consequence their civilian outfits were condemned by the medical officer, and they were compelled to dress in uniform."

4. "Massey, Ward, and Allen had promised that they would not be persecuted or forced to wear uniform."

Reply: "No such promise was made."

5. They were taken in irons to France."

Reply: "There were five of these men who stated that they were conscientious and religious objectors. These latter were not compelled to wear uniform and were not sent to France. The report does not show how many of the remainder were sent to France, nor does it say anything about their being taken in irons, but if such was the case then the obvious conclusion must be that it was necessary for the authorities to take such precautions.

"It is quite clear that the statements referred to were grossly exaggerated, and made for the purpose of prejudicing the administration of the Military Service Act in the eyes of the public. It is no pleasure to the Government or the Defence Authorities to punish men for non-compliance with a necessary law, but in a time of war the Act must be strictly enforced and administered without fear or favour."

My rejoinder was published as follows:—

"In the first place, Mr. Massey makes quite erroneous quotations of my statements. He could easily have ascertained, either from myself or the comprehensive report of my speech published by 'The Maoriland Worker,' the exact statements made by me. Instead of doing this, he appears to have based his denial on the necessarily, condensed reports published in the dailies or hearsay.

"I said: 'Fourteen lads . . . had been flung into prison here, jailed two and three times over for the one offence—a principle vile in law,' etc. Mr. Massey makes me say that they were jailed 'three or four times' for the one offence. He says my statement is grossly untrue. Let the facts decide. The three Baxter brothers were each sentenced to 28 days in Alexandra Barracks, then to 84 days in the common jail, and again to 28 days in Alexandra Barracks, from which prison they were taken to the transport. Mr. W. Little received three similar sentences. Mr. Mark Briggs served a first sentence of 30 days, and was serving a second sentence of 84 days when deported. Mr. Garth C. Ballantyne had served one sentence of 28 days in Alexandra Barracks and was serving a second sentence of 84 days in the common jail when deported. There are also Conscientious Objectors serving second sentences in the jails of New Zealand at the present time.

A REMARKABLE CONTROVERSY.

"I was in error to the extent of one year when I stated that 'some of them were boys of 20.' I should have said 'boys of 21.' Mr. Balantyne, who was arrested on March 21, had attained his twenty-first year on February 16. Mr. Fred Adin was a month older. How Mr. Massey now makes them 22 when arrested is for him to explain.

"Mr. Massey is again in error when he credits me with having said: 'They were taken Home in irons.' I spoke from very complete notes, of which 'The Worker' report is an exact copy. What I said was: ' . . . They were taken from the jail in the dark of night and forcibly placed on a transport. When they were taken out of jail they were not told where they were going. They were carried on the transport like bags of produce. And the transport had left New Zealand before their mothers knew what had been done. Their mothers were given no opportunity of saying good-bye to them, although they were going to almost certain death. They were herded together in a close prison cabin, and when they became seasick were not given vessels to vomit in, with the result that the officer remarked that the cabin 'smelt like a hyena's den.' Three of them were left at Capetown, being too ill to proceed further; and the remainder, along with a number of troops, were transferred to another boat—which also carried passengers. After they left Capetown they were brought on deck, and their own clothes were stripped off them and thrown overboard—he had seen a photo of the incident—and they were forcibly dressed in khaki. They took the khaki off, and were at one time naked on deck. Later they were left with only their singlets and underpants on. On arrival in England they were taken to Sling Camp in irons, and were going about there in singlets and underpants. They were subjected to unthinkable treatment, and later some of them were taken in irons to France and threatened with the death penalty.'

"Mr. Massey says that because 'some of them would not observe ordinary cleanliness, their civilian outfits were condemned by the medical officer, and they were compelled to dress in uniform.' My information is to the effect that all of them were forcibly dressed in uniform. A soldier writing from Sling Camp on October 12 to a friend at Invercargill, says: 'Before we left Wellington they put about a dozen Conscientious Objectors on board. There was a great go to get them to put on the uniform, but they refused. . . . After we left the Cape it was forcibly put on them, and their own clothes were thrown overboard. . . . After the uniform was put on them, they were brought round in front of where the lady passengers were—it was evidently thought they would not pull it off there, but off it came.' The ladies fled, according to the writer, and the Conscientious Objectors were left naked on the deck.

"Mr. Harry Patton, in a letter published in the Christchurch 'Press' (December 28) wrote: 'I was ordered to put on the uniform on the boat, refused, and was forcibly stripped and forcibly dressed in the uniform, pulled it off, had my clothing returned at night. Tran-

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

shipped to another boat at Capetown, kept at the stern of the boat a few nights, clothing taken off and thrown overboard, turned the hose-pipe on me, cold water, then dressed in the uniform, and numerous other little insults all the way.'

"One of the deported men, in a letter written at sea on October 14 (and printed in the 'Green Ray,' Dunedin) described how they were taken from jail after dark on July 12 last, and put on board the transport. They refused to embark, and were forcibly put on board. 'I myself was carried on the shoulder of a military policeman as though I was a bag of chaff,' he wrote. He then describes how they were placed in the clink almost in the corner of the boat, and for the first few days the one porthole was not open, and the door was kept locked, consequently there was little ventilation. They were nearly all seasick, and, in the words of the writer, 'we could not get anything to be sick into, consequently the atmosphere became almost indescribable: to use the officer's own words, "the place smelt like a hyena's den."' He then goes on to say that they were eventually ordered to put on the uniform, and 'on our refusing he (the officer) brought in the military police and took us out one by one on to the top of one of the hatches, and there, in front of the crowd of laughing, jeering soldiers, forcibly stripped us and put the uniform on. . . . I was greatly surprised to notice a number of the officers, who are generally supposed to be gentlemen, apparently enjoying this degrading spectacle; that also cameras were very much in evidence. None of us attempted to resist, but took it all with a quiet smile, and as soon as we got back to the "clink" immediately took off the uniform in spite of threats to tie us up unless we kept it on. We lay on our beds all day in our underclothing, and in the evening they gave us back our own clothes, which, of course, we lost no time in getting into. Kirwan was so ill when carried out to have the uniform put on that he had to be taken to the hospital, where he has been ever since.'

"Mr. Massey again misrepresents me when he states that I said: 'Massey, Ward, and Allen promised that they would not be persecuted or forced to wear uniform.' In the first place, Mr. Massey knows quite well—as all who have listened to my addresses know—that I do not descend to the discourtesy of dropping the prefixes of my opponents. What I said, referring to the persecution of the Conscientious Objectors, was: 'This notwithstanding that Sir James Allen had promised a deputation that they would be subjected to no persecution.' Mr. Massey says, 'No such promise was made.' I was a member of the deputation that waited on Sir James Allen in July last, to protest against the deportation, and I have a very clear recollection of Mrs. Ballantyne (mother of Mr. Garth Ballantyne) asking Sir James for an assurance that the lads would not be subjected to persecution during the voyage to England. The Minister's reply was that 'they would be subjected to no persecution whatever.'

"In addition to the way they were treated on the transports, letters

A REMARKABLE CONTROVERSY.

from soldiers and others in England show what other treatment the objectors were called upon to endure. The London 'Call' of Thursday, November 15, contained the following, under the heading 'Brought from New Zealand in Irons.': 'Further particulars are to hand respecting the New Zealand Conscientious Objectors to whom reference was made recently in these columns. Of the 14 that were embarked to England with the 28th New Zealand Reinforcements, to which they were deemed to be attached, three of them—Sanderson, of North Wairou, and two Baxter brothers, of Otago—were put off the ship at Capetown, as they were too ill to be taken further. The rest were taken to Sling Camp, Salisbury, where they remained in irons in the guardroom for several weeks. Eight of them have now been sent over to France. Most of them went over handcuffed, and therefore still resisting. Their names are: Ballantyne, Harland, Patton, Little, Baxter, Briggs, Maguire, and Kirwan. Of the other three, one is in Codford Military Hospital, suffering from dysentery (Adin, of Foxton), and two are still in Sling Camp (Gray, of Canterbury, and Penwright, of Tasmania).'

"One soldier 'mentioned seeing one of them forced to put on a pack for France. He threw it off immediately. It was again put on and he was handcuffed. He then sat down, and was kicked along at the heels of the draft.'

"On October 27 Mr. Patton wrote to his relatives: 'I am being taken over to France to-night under arrest. I don't know what they are going to do with me there, but you will perhaps hear some day.' On October 26 Mr. L. Kirwan wrote to his relatives to the same effect.

"On November 30, the 'Friend'—a British religious paper—printed a letter from Mr. Patton, in which he stated that three of them reached Etaples on October 28. They refused to parade, and were taken before an officer, by whom he was sent to the guardroom for a few days. His letter runs: 'Then I was ordered out with a pack on. I refused, and the pack was fastened on to me. I refused to walk with the pack, and was dragged about two hundred yards and placed in a tent. . . . There is another Conscientious Objector in the guardroom, named Briggs, who has relatives in Yorkshire. Three other Conscientious Objectors have been sent up to the firing-line—Little, Baxter, and Ballantyne. I don't know what had become of them. The officer told me I would be sent on there, too, and would probably be shot.'

"We now have Mr. Massey making the curious statement that 'there were five of these men who stated that they were Conscientious and Religious Objectors. These latter were not compelled to wear uniform, and were not sent to France.' Mr. Massey's statement does not square with information in the possession of myself and others. The whole 14 were Conscientious Objectors—some for religious reasons, some for Socialist reasons, and some for Irish reasons. Three of them were left at Capetown ill; eight were sent to France; and one

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

was ill in Codford Hospital; Adin and Gray were still in Sling Camp. Where does Mr. Massey get the five who were 'not sent to France' because they professed to be Conscientious Objectors?

"I note with interest that, while Mr. Massey does not admit that these Conscientious Objectors were taken to France in irons, he is prepared to justify the outrage if it really happened.

"Mr. Massey has made no attempt to reply to my exposure of the treatment of Conscientious Objectors at Featherston only the other day. Neither has he deigned to explain why his Government dragged the 14 away by night without giving their mothers any opportunity whatever of bidding them good-bye.

"It is not at all true that my statements 'were grossly exaggerated, and made for the purpose of prejudicing the administration of the Military Service Act in the eyes of the public.' They were made by way of an honest endeavour to save the young men and boys of this country from becoming in a general sense the victims of such atrocities as characterise the conscript service of Prussia and other militaristic countries, and they were further made in the interests of the broken-hearted mothers of New Zealand.

"I take this opportunity to challenge Mr. Massey to set up a Royal Commission—not a military tribunal—to investigate this matter, and to permit the return of the deported Conscientious Objectors for this purpose. Nothing that has ever happened has wrought such evil to our national life as this one incident; I venture to say that it has shocked the finer feelings of every honest-minded militarist, to say nothing of the many thousands who think otherwise.

"In conclusion, in view of the positive discrimination which has characterised the administration of our military law, is not the Prime Minister rather straining the possibilities when he tells us that 'in a time of war the Act must be strictly enforced, and administered without fear or favour.' That is a matter, however, that I shall deal with at my election meetings."

Mr. Massey made a further statement, over which the "Dominion" placed the headlines: "A Tell-tale Letter.—About Conscientious Objectors.—Plain Talk by Mr. Massey," commenting: "Mr. Massey does not follow Mr. Holland further in investigation of the statements as to how the men were treated, but he quotes a letter to show that Conscientious Objectors may not always be deserving of sympathy." Mr. Massey's statement follows:—

"There is just one point I wish the people of this Dominion to thoroughly realise with respect to the men for whom Mr. Holland is endeavouring to create a great deal of unnecessary sympathy as the 'victims of atrocities characteristic of the conscript service of Prussia,' etc.

"I desire to make it clear that so far as the statute law of this country is concerned these men are not Conscientious Objectors, but

A REMARKABLE CONTROVERSY.

soldiers of the Expeditionary Force who have been called up by ballot to take their share in the defence of the country of whose privileges and protection they have taken full advantage, and that so far as the Defence Department, which has to administer the law, is concerned, they must obey orders just the same as their fellow citizens do, and be prepared to accept the consequences of such refusal. These men cannot be allowed to place themselves superior to the will of Parliament and obey no law but their own inclination. If this is tolerated we will soon see an end of all decent order and government and a state of affairs such as is now wrecking unfortunate Russia.

"I want every father and mother who have sons fighting and dying in defence of our liberties and civilisation, and 'for the service of freedom,' not to be led away from the real issue, which is, that these so-called 'religious, conscientious, and Socialistic' objectors demand the right to accept and enjoy all the benefits accruing from the sacrifices of the sons of New Zealand, but repudiate their obligations to share in these sacrifices.

"Mr. Holland has made many statements and quoted many letters in the interests, as he says, 'of the broken-hearted mothers of New Zealand.' I think it is just as well that the parents of New Zealand generally should be given an opportunity to gain a clear conception of the lofty principles and ideals which animate some of these martyrs in the cause of conscience. The following extracts are from a letter which was written by the parent of a 'Conscientious Objector,' whose conscience only developed after his appeal on all other grounds had failed and his claim for exemption had been dismissed:—

"I'm afraid all this villainy is having a bad effect on us. David satisfies me. May he go down quick into hell, may his flesh be torn by dogs, may his name be obliterated. Relax all the law, "Thou shalt not kill," and you'll find ten thousand dead within one week. . . . A father of a returned soldier told me this morning that the French so hate the British and colonials that they refused them the use of their wells, and at the Somme the French women preferred to go behind the German lines to being left to our troops. An American reporter has said that without a million American troops we cannot break the German line. Good job, too. Well, where are we to go after the war? I'm sick of the Union Jack. For thirty years it has been blood-soaked without cessation. We English are played out. There's no good in us. We are a set of brutal thieves. There's a Socialist colony in California. . . . Our real enemy is alive, and none seem to move. . . . Curse them, as Elijah did, and as all did, curse them. Will no one come out? Will not one revolt? Curse them. Curse them hard. They ought to die, for they are not only useless, but a stumbling-block, and by God's laws they should die a slave's death. . . . Damn them, they are rotten. By heaven, the whole country is rotten—

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

absolutely rotten. . . . I'm regretting all the time now that you ever went near this people. It is my first close experience of "soldier," and I find the great mistake: they are scum, not fair, straight people, but criminals worse than jailbirds. . . . The idea of fighting for such filth makes one sick. . . . I'd love to change places with you now. I'd take the oath, and, by God, I'd kill all I could of these black-hearted scum. Curse them. No Australian blacks are lower. . . . Wriggle out, if possible, and don't be particular. Once you can get away from them you can manage till we can leave them to the Japs. May the Japs mutilate every cursed man and rape every woman. War they want—let them go there—we don't want it. . . . Curse them. God curse and blight them. . . . One thing you may be sure about—if we British get a complete victory it will be our last: we shall be intoxicated with our bell-got gains and pride and power, and, just as Rome gained some tremendous battles at her downfall, so with us. . . . I'm thinking that the war is steadily proving the superiority of the Germans at every point."

At the foot of Mr. Massey's statement was printed the following Press Association message from Dunedin:—

"Commenting on the recent reference by Mr. Holland concerning Conscientious Objectors, the Minister of Defence states that the 14 men to whom Mr. Holland referred could not all be classed as Conscientious Objectors. Five had alleged conscientious objections, which the Boards rejected, five had appealed on the ground of hardship and public interest, and did not allege conscientious objections, and four did not appeal. No promise was ever made by Mr. Massey, Sir Joseph Ward, or Sir James Allen that the men would not be forced to wear uniforms. The real religious objector, when exempted by a board, did not wear a uniform, and did service with the Agricultural Department. None of these men were entitled to this course, and most of them had not attempted to prove themselves within the category. The Defence Department knew as much about these men as it knew about any other soldier that was embarked and reached the other end. It was impossible to keep a record of every man's movements."

To the foregoing, I replied:—

"I had hoped that the Prime Minister would make some endeavour to offer an explanation of the facts furnished by me in my last statement. But he has not done so. It is unfortunate that Mr. Massey is completely silent on the matter of Conscientious Objectors being subjected to two and three sentences for the one offence, although he at first denied that more than one sentence could be inflicted. He is also ominously silent about the cruelties which were inflicted on the Conscientious Objectors on the transport and in Sling Camp. He now flies off at another tangent, and argues that 'these men are not Con-

A REMARKABLE CONTROVERSY.

scientious Objectors, but soldiers of the Expeditionary Force,' etc. I have known some of the men—particularly Messrs. Ballantyne and Briggs—for a number of years, and they are not only Conscientious Objectors themselves, but both of them belong to families that have for long years held pronounced views on militarism. Mr. Massey seems to think that the possession of a conscientious principle is a matter to be determined by Act of Parliament or War Regulations. For the first three centuries of the Christian era the Christians generally held similar views to those held by the Christian Conscientious Objectors of to-day; and the rulers of that period took the same view that Mr. Massey and his Government take to-day. Then the conscience men (and women) were flung to the lions or nailed to the cross. Mr. Massey makes a law which refuses to the Catholic, the Anglican, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, the Salvationist, or the Socialist, the right to hold a conscientious objection to military service; and, having made his law, he then pronounces its victims 'conscienceless.' I can appreciate the difficulty which he must necessarily experience in getting the more thoughtful of his own supporters to see it that way.

"But can Mr. Massey explain the apparent contradiction of two of his statements. In the first denial he said: 'There were five of these men who stated they were Conscientious and Religious Objectors. These latter were not compelled to wear uniform and were not sent to France.' I furnished facts in my last statement which completely disposed of this assertion. In his second statement, Mr. Massey tells us 'these men are not Conscientious Objectors,' and he terms them 'these so-called religious, conscientious, and Socialist objectors.' Will he then tell us how it came that, as he first alleged, five of them were treated as Conscientious Objectors if none of them were Conscientious Objectors? Will he also explain the discrepancy between his first statement, which was clearly to the effect that only some of them were compelled to dress in uniform and for the sole reason that their civilian outfits were condemned by the medical officer because they 'would not observe ordinary cleanliness,' and Sir James Allen's statement, which is in effect that 'no promise was ever made . . . that the men would not be forced to wear uniforms'—the implication being, of course, that it was all along intended to compel them to wear uniform. In my speech no reference was made to any promise about a uniform, but only about persecution. However, it is for the Ministers to tell us whose statement is correct.

"I notice Sir James Allen says: 'The Defence Department knew as much about these men as it knew about any other soldier that was embarked and reached the other end.' He adds that it is impossible to keep a record here of every man's movements. If this is so, it is weighty proof of the need for great departmental changes. Fourteen men and boys with conscientious objections are forcibly carried from New Zealand, they are subjected to treatment born of the spirit of Diocletian, some of them are taken in irons to France—one a boy

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

of between 21 and 22—are forced to the firing line, their mothers are almost frantic with anxiety and grief, and for months the Department tells them it can give them no information as to the fate of their boys.

“Why was it left to some of the mothers to learn from private sources—as they have learnt this week—that their boys have been courtmartialled and sentenced to five years’ hard labour? The three sent to the firing line were Messrs. Ballantyne, Little, and Baxter—and these are the men who have been sentenced. Mr. Ballantyne is in a military prison in France, and the others are also in prison, either in France or England. I submit that the Prime Minister’s sneer about ‘the broken-hearted mothers’ will not satisfy the men and women of New Zealand, who, whatever their political attitude or their views on militarism, love justice. One of the things they will want to know is why these men and boys are not brought back to New Zealand.

“It seems to me that there is no language in which could be adequately expressed the regret and resentment which every fair-minded person must have felt on reading the letter (alleged to have come from the parent of an objector) put into print by the Prime Minister with the only possible object of besmirching the parents of the 14 deported objectors. I would urge that the people have a right to expect from the Prime Minister a higher conception of what he owes to his office—a higher regard for the dignity of his position—than to permit the anger of an ill-advised moment to induce him to offer such a letter without the name of the alleged author. The parents of such of the Conscientious Objectors as I am personally acquainted with are as highly respectable and as deeply respected by those who know them, as any member of Mr. Massey’s Cabinet, and would neither be guilty of penning such a letter as the one referred to, nor of putting it into print if it happened to fall into their hands.”

XII.—DEPARTMENTAL INACCURACIES.

So wide was the interest aroused, so great the indignation awakened, because of the treatment of the C.O.’s that towards the close of February, 1918—on the eve of the Wellington North by-election—the Government deemed it advisable that Sir James Allen should issue an official statement covering their cases. The document consisted of eight pages of printed foolscap, and purported to be a statement “as to Objectors generally and the fourteen Objectors who were embarked for service abroad in July, 1917.”

On the front page of this somewhat involved and unfortunately inaccurate and contradictory document, the question was asked: “What has the Defence Department done which it should not have

DEPARTMENTAL INACCURACIES.

done?" and, still more ludicrously, on the same page it was proclaimed, with apparent seriousness: "If responsible authority is to knuckle under to insubordination the whole fabric of the British Empire would crumble into chaos."

Readers should take the trouble to secure copies of this very remarkable document for themselves. It is not possible in the pages of this book to devote any large amount of space to its discussion. I purpose merely dealing with several of its most prominent inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and contradictions.

One of the first of these has to do with the religious bodies. Sir James declared that "the only religious bodies which have so far satisfied the Boards as to their right to exemption are the Christadelphians, Seventh Day Adventists, and Quakers." Still, as the records will show, quite a number of Quakers, and, I think, also Seventh Day Adventists and Christadelphians, found the prison gates slammed behind them.

The Minister was at much pains to controvert the facts set forth in Mr. Garth Ballantyne's letter as to the position and ventilation of the "clink" on the transport, which Sir James endeavoured to show was all that could be desired. The obvious answer to Sir James on this point is that Mr. Ballantyne and the other Objectors were in the "clink" and Sir James was not. The men who spent three weeks in the place are entitled to have their word taken in preference to that of the politician who had frequently admitted that he had neither facts nor information concerning the Objectors.

In his statement Sir James Allen declared that if the Objectors were forcibly dressed in khaki it was because their own clothes were condemned by the medical officer. But the Minister neglected (perhaps wisely so) to explain why, if their clothes were so condemned, they were permitted to have them back after the first forcible dressing, and why they were permitted to wear the condemned clothes until Capetown was reached.

Sir James quoted a report from General Godley, in which the General stated that two Generals (whose names are for some reason withheld) desired that the Objectors should be sent with drafts in the usual way "and treated like any other soldier." To this, however, General Godley said he did not consent, and it is clear that his reason for not agreeing was not because of any desire to respect the conscientious objection of the men concerned, but because if they were sent with drafts "the inevitable result of it would be that they would either desert or else refuse to go up to the trenches when ordered, and would then be shot for refusing to do duty in the face of the enemy," and General Godley thought that this would be the very worst thing that could happen—it "would make martyrs of them."

In a report of a week later, if Sir James Allen's statement is correct, General Godley intimated that "all the Conscientious Objectors sent from New Zealand, except two, have agreed to do duty

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

either in the infantry or as stretcher-bearers." It will be seen that the General makes no fine distinctions, such as Mr. Massey and Sir James Allen sought to draw at this end. He recognises all the fourteen as genuine Conscientious Objectors. He attributes "the conversion to a reasonable attitude of the majority of these men to the fact that they were separated and posted to different companies and units." It had been recognised that strength is born of association, and that the men could never be broken down while they were together. But the General is silent on the dreadful experiences the Objectors were called upon to undergo—experiences in which Sir James Allen may at this late hour be able to discern "the process of their conversion," which he told the Orphan Club he did not know.

In this same report of General Godley's, after notifying that all but two had given in, there is another notification to the effect that, "in addition to the two Conscientious Objectors mentioned, there have been three others who have been treated like any other soldier, and have had to be tried by courtmartial in France on a charge of disobedience to an order," that the Court had found them guilty and condemned them to five years' penal servitude, and that he had commuted the sentence to two years' hard labour, with a recommendation that this be "suspended" to three months if their conduct in prison was good. This was another phase of "the process of their conversion."

In this latter part of General Godley's report there was one important omission and two most extraordinary contradictions. The General omitted to say that a New Zealander sentenced under the military law to more than two years could not have been held in a French military prison, and would have had to be returned to New Zealand to serve the sentence. The report that the three men sentenced were treated "like any other soldier" furnishes a complete contradiction of the General's report of only a week earlier, in which he says he would not agree to the suggestion of the two other Generals that the Objectors should be treated "like any other soldier." Yet another contradiction is apparent when he says first that all the Objectors brought from New Zealand but two have given in and then reports that three others have been sentenced by courtmartial because they would not give in. In compiling his second report the General must surely have forgotten all about the earlier one.

As further showing the extreme carelessness with which the official statement must have been prepared, it may be mentioned that Sir James Allen's assertion that Mr. Garth Ballantyne was drawn in the first ballot was altogether wrong. Mr. Ballantyne was drawn in the second ballot. Sir James said: "He appealed on the grounds that his calling up was contrary to public interest because of his occupation and a hardship to his employers, a firm of surveyors. He was represented by a prominent Wellington solicitor, his case was carefully fought out, and the question of religion or conscientious objection was

DEPARTMENTAL INACCURACIES.

never raised." This is almost a complete mass of inaccuracies. It is true that Mr. Ballantyne lodged an appeal, but he did not think it worth while to appear. He was not "represented by a prominent Wellington solicitor," nor by anyone else; neither was his case "carefully fought out." His employer engaged the solicitor and appealed to the Court on the ground that Ballantyne, who was a surveyor, was engaged on work of national importance. When a telegram was sent by the military authorities to Mr. Ballantyne asking why he did not parade, he replied, briefly: "Conscientious Objector."

In view of these and other facts, it is not a matter for wonder that the time came when Defence Department statements concerning the Conscientious Objectors were received with little or no credence.

Meanwhile, the deported men were undergoing tortures and experiencing tyrannies that should make every freedom-loving man and woman in New Zealand ashamed to remember.

XIII.—THE PROCESS OF CONVERSION.

Speaking at the Orphan's Club on August 25, 1918, Sir James Allen (designated Orphan Allen) is reported by the Wellington "Dominion" to have said: "Some time ago fourteen Objectors went to the front, and every one of them are now fighting with their units. The process of their conversion he did not know." The grammar of this sentence may with fairness be debited to the "Dominion." But for the inaccuracy of it the Minister must carry the responsibility. My information is that only one of the fourteen men took a gun, that others, also surrendering to that cruel "process of conversion" which Sir James Allen told the Orphans he did not know (but which will be made perfectly clear in these pages), accepted ambulance or other non-combatant work, while some went to the brink of Hell and the borderland of Death and still did not yield to the military "process of conversion." The letters which follow—as well as others quoted in my controversy with Mr. Massey—will give some indication of what that "process" amounted to. The statements of Messrs. Briggs, Ballantyne, and Baxter in later chapters will make the "process" still clearer.

A soldier who went home with the same draft as the C.O.'s, writing from Sling Camp on October 12, 1917, to the secretary of his Union in Southland, first of all explained that there was a strike on the boat which carried the C.O.'s away. The quality of the stew supplied to the soldiers formed the basis of this upheaval, and the men "had a win." Then he described the death at sea of one of the soldiers, who had been parading sick every morning, but who nevertheless

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

was ordered into a cold shower bath at six in the morning (as all the men were). The sick man did not want to go into the shower, but "orders are orders here." He eventually took the shower, "went into the hospital at 3 in the afternoon, died at 8, and was over the side at 11." The soldier then furnishes an account of the treatment accorded the C.O.'s, and particularly the incident of their being placed on the passenger deck after being forcibly dressed. He bitterly complains that the Norman Castle carried "eight hundred troops and over a hundred passengers," and says he assumes that this was the reason why Germany took to sinking what were supposed to be passenger boats.

L. J. Kirwan wrote to his brother from Sling Camp on September 26, 1917:—"I am being sent to France to-night. . . . Our days are numbered. Man's life is not worth much in France. I cannot tell you how we have been treated. . . . I am not allowed to write what I would like to, for it would get torn up by the censor. 'Life is real, life is earnest; and the grave is not its goal.'"

On October 26, 1917, T. P. Harland wrote from Sling Camp: "Since last writing I have to inform you that Ballantyne and Briggs (C.O.'s) have been sent to France with full pack up. I am not sure whether Maguire has been sent yet. I applied for leave to visit London, but was refused because I would not drill, otherwise fuller information would have been available. If you did not receive my previous letter, please allow me to repeat that Little and Baxter were sent to France with full pack up and handcuffed. As to the position with regard to Penright and Adin, I have no information."

On October 26, 1917, Harry Patton wrote to his brother from Sling Camp: "I am being taken to France to-night under arrest. I don't know what they are going to do with me there, but you will perhaps hear some day. I shall not take up a rifle or anything like that."

"The Friend," 30th November, 1917, published the following:—Harry Patton, one of the New Zealand C.O.'s sent to France, writes: "I received your letter yesterday; it gave me a great deal of comfort. I am in an isolation camp at present at Etaples for 21 days. Three of us reached Etaples on 28th October, refused to parade, and were taken before an officer. The other two took on stretcher-bearing in the R.A.M.C. Three were placed in a tent by ourselves for three days, and then transferred to the R.A.M.C. I refused to parade, and was taken before the officer. He told me I had been transferred to the R.A.M.C., and that I would be saving life. I told him anything I did in the military was helping to take life, and that I would not do it, so I was put into the guardroom for a few days. Then I was ordered out with a pack on. I refused, and the pack was fastened to me. I refused to walk with the pack, and was dragged about two hundred yards and placed in a tent. For three days I was ordered to parade every day; kept refusing; had officers to see me, trying to talk me round; taken before a chaplain, gave him my views; was placed in

THE PROCESS OF CONVERSION.

detention. They tried to get me to work in the garden; refused. Then measles broke out. There is another C.O. in the guardroom named Briggs, who has relations in Yorkshire. Three other C.O.'s have been sent up to the firing-line—Little, Baxter, and Ballantyne. I don't know what has become of them. The officer told me I would be sent up there, too, and would probably be shot. The two in the R.A.M.C. have refused to take the oath or to take pay; so I don't know how they will get on."

On December 12, 1917, Fred Adin wrote from Sling Camp to his sister: "I hope you won't think ill of me for doing what I have done, but it was a matter of life or death. A few weeks more of imprisonment would have killed me. I was nothing but skin and bone when I came out of the hospital, and I could not have stood it if I had gone back to prison. Nobody knows what we put up with on the trip across and after we arrived here. I could tell you something that would startle you, but it is over now, so I will say nothing about it." He then went on to say that he hoped his action would not make it harder for his two brothers—both C.O.'s in New Zealand. Writing to his mother he said: "Now I have given in I shall be able to write to you"—showing that he was not allowed to write while refusing service.

On March 5, 1918, from "Somewhere in France," Archibald Baxter wrote to his parents in Dunedin:—"My Dear Father and Mother,—I have just time to send you this brief note. I am being sent up the lines to-morrow. I have not heard where Jack and Sandy are. As far as military service goes, I am of the same mind as ever. It is impossible for me to serve in the army. I would a thousand times rather be put to death, and I am sure that you all believe the stand I take is right. I have never told you since I left N.Z. of the things I have passed through; for I know how it would hurt you. I only tell you now, so that, if anything happens to me, you will know. I have suffered to the limit of my endurance, but I will never in my sane senses surrender to the evil power that has fixed its roots like a cancer on the world. I have been treated as a soldier who disobeys (No. 1 Field Punishment). That is hard enough at this time of the year, but what made it worse for me was that I was bound to refuse to do military work, even as a prisoner. It is not possible for me to tell in words what I have suffered. But you will be glad to know that I have met with a great many men who have shown me the greatest kindness. I know that your prayers for me are not in vain. I will pray for you all to the last; it is all I can do for you now. If you hear that I have served in the Army or that I have taken my own life, do not believe that I did it in my sound mind. I never will."

On May 14, 1918, the Base Records Office, Wellington, forwarded a communication to Mr. Baxter's father as follows: "Dear Sir,—Re 47841 Pte. Archibald Baxter, I have to advise you that a cablegram has been received from overseas, stating that the above-named soldier

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

was admitted to hospital, United Kingdom, and that his mental condition was causing anxiety. I sincerely trust that with care, rest and attention, Pte. Baxter will soon be restored to his natural condition."

On September 4, 1918, Garth Ballantyne wrote from France to his mother: "Little and I joined up with the Division about five days ago. We came at a bad time, as they were in the middle of a big stunt. I am now stretcher-bearing in the Hawke's Bay Co., 1st W.I.B. We both worked on the same stretcher most of the time, I myself coming through so far untouched, but Little was wounded two days ago. He was hit with a machine gun bullet while he and I and two others were attempting to get another man out. . . . I thoroughly hate the whole business, although in this particular job there is the satisfaction of knowing that you are helping other poor fellows who are suffering."

In October, 1918, Sir James Allen found it necessary to issue a second printed document containing "official statements" as to the case of Archie Baxter and the remainder of the fourteen deportees. This new "statement" contained the allegation that Baxter "is apparently of a surly, morose disposition, and does not say much." Sir James further declared that "the medical examiners found that he was not insane, and that he did not require to be sent to a hospital, mental or otherwise." In view of this statement, it was surely cruel and bordering on the brutal to notify Mr. Baxter's parents (as was done on May 14, 1918) to the effect that he had been "admitted to hospital, as his mental condition was causing anxiety."

Sir James Allen, in the official statement referred to, proceeded to explain the nature of Field Punishment No. 1, and resented the term of "crucifixion" applied to this form of punishment. He omitted to say that the British soldiers in the first place and the British militarists of the Blatchford type in the second place were responsible for this term. Sir James Allen's explanation went to show that an offender sentenced to Field Punishment No. 1 "may be kept in irons," and "when in irons he may be attached for a period or periods not exceeding two hours in any one day to a fixed object, but he must not be so attached during more than three out of any four consecutive days, nor during more than 21 days in all." It was further explained that although "irons should be used when available," when irons are not available "straps or ropes should be used."

The soldiers called it crucifixion because the men punished were often lashed to the wheels of gun carriages, with arms and legs extended, as though the victim were on a cross. But Sir James Allen refrained from explaining this. A British soldier—a well-to-do business man, who enlisted during the early part of the war—was subjected to this atrocious treatment, and died under it. His "offence" was that he had lost his gas helmet. The matter was ventilated in the House of Commons, and fiercely denounced by Robert Blatchford in the "Sunday Pictorial." I had, on every occasion on which I made

THE PROCESS OF CONVERSION.

reference to this matter, insisted that the N.Z. Government should intimate to the Imperial authorities that it would not tolerate the infliction of such a barbarism on any man from these shores, whether soldier or C.O.

On September 16, 1918, there came from Little's mother at Hikurangi to Ballantyne's mother at Wellington a brief note with a heart-broken message: "Just a line to let you know we have just received a wire saying that our dear boy died of wounds on September 4. The cruel brutes! We may never know how he died."

On November 22, 1918, Garth Ballantyne wrote from France to his mother: "At last the long-looked-for time has arrived, and hostilities have ceased. Peace should be finally settled before long. The censorship has been slightly lifted, and we can now say where we are and where we have been. I have just received very bad news. Wm. Little died from the wound I told you he received. I have written to his mother, giving her as many details as I could. . . . At least, he died trying to save life and not trying to take it. . . . Sanderson has been sent to a convalescent home. I have also heard that Gray was for some reason returning. Perhaps you will hear from him. He could tell you much that would interest you."

XIV.—PERIODS OF SUSPENSE.

From time to time scraps of information filtered through concerning the deported men, mostly in surreptitiously-sent letters from soldiers on active service and sometimes at the hands of returning soldiers. One of these latter brought me the ticket giving the "Result of N.Z. Medical Board, Etaples, 9/10, 1918," in Mark Briggs's case. It is signed by Major Bowerbank, and bears out Mark Briggs's statement.

The parents and other relatives and friends of the deported men—overwhelmed with anxiety—were making every effort to ascertain their fate, for a considerable time without success. Relatives of several of the men wrote to me repeatedly to the effect that they could obtain no information.

On May 31, 1918, Mr. Ballantyne's parents were forwarded the following communication from the Base Records Office, Wellington: "The latest entry on your son's record here shows that he was transferred to the Canterbury Regiment on the 11th October, 1917, and that on the 14th November, 1917, he was tried by field general courtmartial and sentenced to five years' penal servitude, which sentence was commuted by Lt-General Sir A. J. Godley to two years' imprisonment with hard labour."

On August 13, 1918, Mrs. Ballantyne wrote to Sir James Allen:

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

"Can you give me some information about my son, Garth C. Ballantyne, who was deported. It is now 13 months since you sent him away, and in all that time I have received only two letters from him: one written on the voyage and one from a military prison in France, dated December 12, 1917. Since then I have had no letters from him, and as I am absolutely certain he would write if allowed and if still alive, you will understand I am terribly anxious. Last month I received a notice from Base Records that he had been in hospital five months previously. Such information was, of course, so old that it was worse than none. I notice that you stated publicly that you were arranging for parents to get news of their sons every three months, and should like to know when we may expect this news."

Sir James replied on August 18, denying that any restriction was placed on the correspondence of the Objectors, and, after giving one or two very meagre items of information, concluded: "I have asked that reports shall be forwarded to New Zealand from time to time respecting soldiers who have refused to perform military duties, but no report has yet reached me concerning your son." A feature of this letter is the studied references to "Private" Ballantyne, and the persistent use of the term "soldier," as though the object of the letter was to impress upon the stricken mother the fact that the military authorities were determined that she should be made to feel that her son was a "soldier," and not a Conscientious Objector.

On August 27, 1918, Mrs. Ballantyne wrote again to Sir James Allen challenging his statement to the Orphans' Club that everyone of the fourteen "were now fighting with their units," and mentioning that since her last letter she had had a few lines from her son, who wrote from prison and gave no indication that he intended "fighting with his unit." Mrs. Ballantyne added: "You expressed a hope that 'some day the story of the Conscientious Objectors would be written.' Your wish will be gratified, for it is being written even now, and when the time comes for it to be published it will not be the C.O.'s who will be shamed, but the Government that has so ill-treated them." For Sir James's edification she quoted from the writing of a Religious Objector: "German atrocities! Are the people's eyes in this country so fixed on France that they cannot see what is going on in their own land?"

Repeatedly I endeavored to secure definite information concerning the deportees, but without avail. Towards the close of the 1918 second session (see Hansard, vol. 183, page 1091), I asked the Minister of Defence: "(1) Whether he will furnish a report as to the number of members of the New Zealand Expeditionary Forces who have been subjected to the punishment known as crucifixion or Field Punishment No. 1? (2) Whether Mark Briggs, one of the fourteen Conscientious Objectors deported last year, is now in hospital and classed C2 and permanently unfit; and, if so, when will he be returned to New Zealand? (3) Whether he will call for a full report in connec-

PERIODS OF SUSPENSE.

tion with the case of Mark Briggs, and also a return showing the number of New Zealand Conscientious Objectors subjected to Field Punishment No. 1?"

The Hon. Sir J. Allen (Minister of Defence) replied: "(1) Field Punishment No. 1 is sparingly inflicted in the New Zealand Expeditionary Force. If the honorable gentleman will move for a return of the number of soldiers of the New Zealand Expeditionary Forces who have been subjected to Field Punishment No. 1 the matter will be considered. (2) The Military Service Act does not recognise the 'Conscientious Objector'; it recognises only the 'Religious Objector.' It is incorrect to term the fourteen men who were embarked on the 17th July, 1917, 'Conscientious Objectors'; there were five 'Religious Objectors' who had failed to satisfy the Military Service Boards, and the remainder were 'Defiant Objectors,' including four deserters. Mark Briggs was one of the 'Defiant Objectors'; no advice has been received that Mark Briggs is now in hospital and classed C2 and permanently unfit. (3) Mark Briggs was an auctioneer, of Palmerston North, and was drawn in the third ballot. He appealed on the grounds of public interest and hardship, but did not appear in support of his appeal, which the Military Service Board dismissed. He was sent into camp, and refused to obey orders, and was courtmartialled in New Zealand for disobedience. He was embarked on the 17th July, 1917; refused duty on the transport, and was awarded 28 days' detention on the 15th September, 1917; arrived in Sling on the 25th September; proceeded overseas on the 20th October, 1917, and was posted to 3rd Battalion, Auckland Regiment, on the 11th December, 1917; by orders dated the 21st January, 1918, it appears that he was awarded 28 days' Field Punishment No. 1. Unless the fourteen men embarked on the 17th July, 1917, are regarded as 'Conscientious Objectors' (which would be incorrect), no New Zealand 'Conscientious Objectors' have been subjected to Field Punishment No. 1."

In the middle of 1918, several returned soldiers came to my residence at Brooklyn and recounted to me some of the tortures inflicted upon Mark Briggs. On the strength of their report, I made my statement on the floor of the House on the night of December 6, 1918, during the course of my speech in opposition to the third reading of the Bill to deprive Conscientious Objectors of their franchise and civil rights generally, when I said: "Take one particular case—that of Mr. Mark Briggs, one of the fourteen men deported. . . . On one occasion he was dragged with ropes around him through shell craters and left almost for dead—not by the soldiers, but by the military police—and the soldiers were so exasperated that on that particular night they went round with hand grenades looking for the police; so great was the respect which Briggs had won from the soldiers themselves by the attitude he had taken up. Fortunately, the police were out of the way, and nothing happened."

In due time the deported men began to arrive back in New Zea-

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

land, and it was then that their friends found themselves listening to calmly-told stories of atrocities perpetrated and brutalities endured—stories woven out of a period of wretchedness in which the wild spirit of the primitive actuated the torturers and the firm purpose of a lofty principle inspired the tortured—stories to make the blood run cold with horror or flame righteously into indignation and shame. And it is here that I purpose letting three of the men who endured write into this history their own terrible experiences in their own honest language—three of the men who, out of the night that covered them, “black as the pit from pole to pole,” had reason to thank “whatever gods there be” for their unconquerable souls. The three chapters which follow are from the pens of Messrs. Briggs, Baxter, and Ballantyne. Others of the fourteen may have other narratives to startle all that is best in New Zealand out of a lethargy that is twin to Oppression. When these statements are read, there will be no righteously-minded man or woman who, having read them, will not register deep vows before the high altars of Humanity that never again shall the dreadful atavism of such a system be permitted to steal from the jungle and fasten its fangs in the fair white throat of our civilisation.

XV.—MARK BRIGGS.

At the time the mis-called National Register was taken, Mr. Briggs was employed as a flax-worker at Manga-iti, in the Waikato district. In filling in the register form, he stated that he held conscientious objections to military service, and that he was not prepared to serve with the army either in or out of New Zealand; but he further stated that he was prepared to do any work of national importance (other than war work) either in or out of New Zealand, provided it was work for which he was fitted.

The story which follows is Mark Briggs's own narrative:—

I was drawn in the Third Ballot, and duly notified by registered letter to parade for medical examination. I ignored the order, and some time later a military officer with the rank of major appeared at my place of business and handed me another notice, at the same time saying: “You will parade at Duke Street, Palmerston North, at half-past nine to-morrow morning.” I replied: “I will not.” The Major then said: “Will later in the day suit you?” I said: “No.” He then asked: “You are the Mark Briggs who was drawn in the ballot, are you not?” I replied: “I have had sufficient notifications from the military authorities to lead me to believe I am.” The

MARK BRIGGS.

Major then wanted to know when it would suit me to appear for examination. I told him that it would never suit me. He then said: "All right; I'll send you a registered notice in the morning." The Major then walked out, and next morning the third notice (registered) came to hand. I took no notice of this; and I next received a card ordering me to parade at Palmerston North preparatory to proceeding to camp. Of this I also took no notice. Then, after all these interviews and notices, I found my name gazetted as "Missing and cannot be found." When this Gazette notice appeared in the Palmerston North papers it was the source of much amusement.

In the meantime, I lodged an appeal on formal grounds, solely for the purpose of gaining time. I did not appear to support the appeal, which was, of course, dismissed.

On or about the 23rd of March, 1917, at nine in the morning, a police officer put in an appearance with a warrant for my arrest, and I was taken to the Defence Office, where I was asked by the officer if I was now prepared to be medically examined. I replied, "No." I was then put in a room where six or eight red-caps were amusing themselves playing cards. At about two in the afternoon I was taken to the military barracks by two red-caps. I was next taken before the higher officers and was asked all the questions on the attestation paper, answering "No" in practically every instance. I was then taken to the police station by the red caps, where I remained all night, and next day taken back to the barracks and presented before the same officers, when the procedure of the preceding day was practically gone through again. The officer in charge at last intimated that I would proceed to Trentham at 11.30 that day. "How many police will it take to conduct you there?" he asked me. I replied: "It took one of the civil police to arrest me, two military police to bring me down here in the first place, two to take me to the police station, and four to fetch me from there down here this morning. I leave you to be the judge." He then said he supposed one would do, and immediately ordered one of the military police to take me to Wellington, at the same time handing him a pair of handcuffs. I was brought to Wellington, and at Lambton Station was met by Mr. H. E. Holland, then editor of "The Maoriland Worker."

I was taken out to Trentham, and placed in Details that night. The next morning I was taken before Colonel Potter, Camp Commandant, and was charged with disobeying the order to parade, and the charge was dismissed on technical grounds. I was, however, not permitted to return home; but was taken to the Records Office, where an attestation paper was placed before me and I was requested to sign it, which I refused to do. I was then placed in the "clink." The following morning I was again taken before Colonel Potter, and was once more charged with having disobeyed a lawful command given by

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

my superior officer. After evidence had been tendered, I was asked what I had to say to the charge, and replied that I didn't admit that I had a superior officer. Colonel Potter asked if I would take a sentence from him or be tried by courtmartial. I replied that I would not take his sentence, and was, accordingly, remanded for court-martial.

A day or two later I was taken, along with Mr. Levett, from the "clink" to the medical hut by the military police. At the medical hut I was subjected to an examination which resolved itself into a heart test. This test was made by two doctors, and the papers were duly filled in. We were then taken back to the "clink," and on the way there the military policeman said: "You have no need to trouble; you'll be out of camp in three days. Have a look at this." He showed both Levett and myself the medical report, which was to the effect that I was not medically fit to undergo a courtmartial trial. A few days later I was taken before another doctor, and by him was passed fit to undergo hard labour, etc. That day I was courtmartialled, the charge being the stereotyped one of disobeying a lawful command. The President of the courtmartial asked me: "Are you a religious objector?" I replied that I did not base my objections on religious grounds. "What, then, do you stand for?" he asked. "For the liberty and freedom of the masses of the people of New Zealand," I replied. "But, my dear fellow," he said, "if you stood for the liberty and freedom of the people of New Zealand, you'd be fighting the Germans. What do you mean when you say you stand for the liberty and freedom of the people?" "I stand absolutely opposed to the Conscription Act, which was placed on the Statute Book by a few irresponsible individuals," I said. He retorted: "You elected these men to Parliament to make the laws, and you should obey them." "If that is your contention," I said, "you must uphold every German in the trenches, because they are only obeying laws made similarly by the irresponsible individuals in their country." He didn't reply to this; and I was sentenced to thirty days' hard labour in the civil prison, which sentence I served in Mount Cook Prison. At the end of the thirty days I was taken from Mount Cook to the Terrace Jail, and handed over to the military police. I was next taken by the red-caps to Alexandra Barracks, kept there a few hours; then taken by the military police to the police station at Lambton Quay. Late that night I was taken from there to Trentham. Next day I was ordered to take my kit and refused. The following morning I was again charged before Colonel Potter with disobeying a lawful command. I again declined to receive a sentence from the Colonel, and was duly remanded for another courtmartial. I went through the usual medical procedure, and was again passed fit for hard labour. I was once more courtmartialled and found guilty, and after waiting a fortnight for sentence, was told that "it was a washout"—which meant that no sentence would be promulgated.

MARK BRIGGS.

A few days later I was again taken before a doctor, and, as usual, passed fit to undergo hard labour; and was taken without any notice whatever straight from there before a third courtmartial, and again charged with disobeying a lawful command. When asked if I had anything to say, I raised the objection that the military law required that a man should be given 24 hours' notice of courtmartial proceedings, and that I had been brought there at a moment's notice. The President said. "Oh, that doesn't matter." I replied that if that was so it was not worth my while putting up any defence whatever, and accordingly I took no further part in the proceedings. I again had to wait a fortnight before sentence was pronounced. It proved to be 84 days' hard labour. Of this I served seven weeks at Mount Cook Prison.

On the morning of July 13, 1917, I was taken from Mount Cook along with seven others to the Terrace Jail. Here we were given our own clothes, shaved, and kept in the yard all day. I saw Mr. Peter Fraser that afternoon, and shook hands with him as he was going in to his cell. We were kept in the yard until after dark, when we were taken inside and handed over to a military escort, which outnumbered us by two to one. Without being told where we were going, we were marched through the streets with the members of the escort all around us, and in this way were taken to the wharf, where a transport was lying. By this time we recognised that the move was to forcibly transport us. When we reached the foot of the gangway, one of the boys in the front rank shouted: "Are we going to walk up the gangway, Mark?" I replied: "Certainly not." We were then seized and forced up the gangway. As they were taking me up I called out to the wharf labourers: "You can tell the citizens of Wellington that there are eight conscientious objectors forcibly deported in civvie clothes from New Zealand." They replied: "You have our sympathy." I answered back: "We want more than that." By this time they had got us on deck. The eight of us were pushed into the "clink" together, and an armed guard of four men with fixed bayonets was placed on the inside of the door of the "clink," and remained there all night.

The eight men thus forcibly placed on board were: Garth Ballantyne, Penwright, Adin, Gray, Patten, Saunderson, Harland, and myself. Next morning we were joined by the three Baxters and Little, and later Maguire and Kirwan were brought from Trentham Camp and placed along with us. That afternoon (July 14) the boat, the Waitemata, pulled out from the wharf and sailed.

The "clink" was about 22 feet by 10 feet, and the first night out the whole fourteen of us were compelled to sleep there. There were no basins, and twelve out of the fourteen were sea-sick. Penwright and myself alone were able to keep right, and we attended to the others. The state of the cabin can be well imagined. Penwright and I cleaned it up in the morning, after getting a drink of tea for

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

the others. We both got ill as a result of the state of the cabin. We were kept in this "clink" all next day, being left to ourselves. The third day out a non-commissioned officer told us we were to do "fatigue." We said we would not go out. "Then," he said, "we will drag you out." I said, "Carry on." We were not dragged out.

The fourth day out the same n.c.o. came to the "clink" again, this time with a guard, took out the kits which had been placed there, ordered us out, and when we refused to go carried us out separately, stripped us on the hatchway, and forcibly dressed us in khaki. We were stripped and dressed in the presence of hundreds of men. After we had all been dressed, we were pushed back into the "clink." As soon as we were back in the "clink" I started to undress, when some of the guard who had dressed us came over to stop me. Members of the guard asked me to keep my clothes on until they were out of the way. I refused. An officer standing in the "clink" doorway said, "Tie him up." "Yes," I said; "put me in the darkest dungeon on the boat, and I'll take them off there." Eventually they went away, and we all took the khaki off. They had kept our civilian clothes, and we remained dressed in nothing but our under-clothing until after tea that evening, when the kits were brought back containing our clothes. We immediately donned our own things and shoved the khaki back in the kits. On this day we were given a short crop.

From this fourth day out until the day before Capetown was reached, we were occasionally allowed on deck for fresh air. Kirwan was in hospital from the third day out until we reached Capetown. Before Capetown was reached, however, measles broke out on the boat. Now, the "clink" was situated under the poop deck, and the other part of the ship under the poop deck was made an isolation place for the measles cases. Barring one porthole in the "clink" and one in the adjoining cell, the only ventilation for the "clink" came through the isolation (hospital) ward. It was not to be wondered at that four of the C.O.'s developed measles, three (Archie Baxter, J. Baxter, and Sanderson) being taken off at Capetown, too ill to proceed further.

The day before our arrival at Capetown we were told by the n.c.o. that we should have to help load the boat there. We intimated that we would not do it, whereupon we were told that if we refused we should be kept below all the time the boat remained at Capetown. Consequently, during the whole fortnight we were at Captown, we were not allowed on deck until we were transhipped to the Norman Castle on the day we were to sail for England.

The first night we spent on the Norman Castle we were placed on the poop deck, and the only shelter overhead was the gun platform, the planks of which were well apart. We suffered intensely from the cold, not averaging two blankets each. Next morning two lieutenants came along, and told us we had to have a bath. I said:

MARK BRIGGS.

"Very good; we haven't had enough bathing since we left New Zealand; but," I added, "if those men are bringing up the kits for the purpose of getting us into khaki, I am not going to help you by taking these clothes off—you'll have to take them from me forcibly." One of the lieutenants replied: "We will soon do that." Orders were now given, and our clothes were stripped from us and thrown overboard. The ship's hose, used for washing down the decks, was then turned on us, after which they dried us in a sort of way with towels, and forcibly dressed us up in khaki. We were then left alone on the poop deck, and eight of us at once stripped off the khaki, and then went all day in underclothing. The following day they came along again, and this time the underclothing was taken from us by force, again the hose was played on us, and again we were dressed in khaki. As soon as the guard left us we promptly divested ourselves of the military clothing, and now remained clad only in shirt and singlet. During the whole day this was our sole attire. Next morning they stripped us naked, and this time redressed us in just khaki tunic and pants. We immediately removed these and went naked, using towels for loin cloths. It has to be remembered that the Norman Castle carried passengers as well as troops, and apparently the military martinets thought we would not strip the khaki off in view of these. However, we remained in this state during the whole of the remainder of the journey, until within three days' sail of Plymouth, when we managed to get possession of a shirt and underpants. We arrived in Plymouth Harbour clad in these.

It may be mentioned that all through the danger zone we were kept down below under lock and key. When the guard had to take anyone up to the latrines he left the door locked. Had anything happened he could not possibly have got down to release us.

The morning we arrived at Plymouth, and on which we were to disembark, we were again forcibly dressed in khaki. Several of us refused to walk ashore. I was dragged along the deck by the n.c.o., and was then seized and frog-marched down the gangway on to the lighter. I was next carried ashore from the lighter, and, refusing to walk to the train, was lifted on to a truck and wheeled to the carriage, into which I was lifted. Reaching the flag station at which we were to disembark for Sling Camp, I refused to leave the train, and was dragged out, and left lying on the platform in charge of a non-commissioned officer until a military escort came from the camp to take me along. Arrived at Sling Camp, I was put in what was termed the Wellington "clink." There was a "clink" for each district. I found Ballantyne, Masuire, and Adin there. While having tea a sergeant-major came and asked for my name and regimental number. I gave him my name, but told him I recognised no regimental number. He angrily ordered me to stand up when speaking to him. This I refused to do, and another n.c.o. unsuccessfully endeavoured to drag me to my feet. The sergeant-major then declared

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

that I was to have no tea if I refused to obey orders, and I thereupon walked away, and eventually went to bed without tea.

Adin was taken away to the hospital; and on the morning after our arrival, Ballantyne, Maguire and myself refused to wear the khaki, and were each forcibly dressed, and were now placed in separate cells. Immediately we were in the cells, we removed the khaki again. An escort came in, and once more forcibly dressed us and handcuffed us, fastening our hands behind our backs. We were now ordered to be placed on bread and water for two days. We refused to take the bread and water. After tea-time the handcuffs were taken off, and immediately our hands were free we again stripped off the khaki. In the meantime, we were given our blankets and mattresses.

On the day following our arrival at Sling Camp, I was lying on the floor of the cell, in an endeavour to rest my shoulders. The effect of the hands being fastened behind for hours was to cause the shoulders to ache distressfully, and the only possible way to relieve the pain was to lie face downward on the floor. While in that position, Brigadier-General Fulton (the officer in charge at Sling Camp) entered the cell. As soon as he saw the position I was in, he exclaimed: "Tut, tut, tut! How long is this going to last?" "As long as the military oppression lasts," I replied. He then asked me if he had the irons removed from my wrists would I promise to wear the khaki for a couple of days until he could get word from the New Zealand Government as to what he was to do with me. I said: "I will make you a faithful promise that when the handcuffs are removed I will immediately remove the khaki." He said that in that case he should have to leave the irons on me, as "it was his duty to consider the health of the men affected, and, of course, he could not let them go without clothing."

On the day following that on which we had been ordered bread and water, the doctor came into my cell, and noticing the bread and water on the floor of the cell untouched, he asked me if I was not hungry. I replied that was a foolish question seeing that I had had nothing to eat all the previous day. He then asked me why I didn't take the bread and water. I answered that I had never lived on that fare before, and if that was the best they could offer me they had better keep it. He then took my pulse, and casually remarked: "You'll do until to-morrow morning."

A Methodist chaplain also visited me, and having listened to my experiences on the boat, asked me if it was worth while one man knocking his head against a stone wall. I asked him how he could possibly say a thing like that when, Sunday after Sunday, in his own church, he sang:—

Dare to be a Daniel,
Dare to stand alone,
Dare to have a purpose firm,
And dare to make it known.

MARK BRIGGS.

He eventually told me that his own conscience would condemn him if he endeavoured to sway me from my determination.

We remained twenty-three days in all in solitary confinement cells, every day of which we were forcibly dressed and handcuffed. The only time during which we were freed from the handcuffs was at meal-times, and while we mopped out the cells immediately after breakfast. We did this latter work because we desired to keep our cells clean.

In the interval we were visited by various officers, one of the most prominent of whom would come into the cell and abuse us. On one occasion this officer came into my cell with a doctor, and ordered the handcuffs to be taken off. As soon as this was done I removed the khaki, and stacked it up on the floor between the officer and myself. While I was doing this he ordered me not to take my uniform off, but I persisted. He then told me to take the underclothing off as well, but I told him that was not necessary—that I merely took the uniform off to demonstrate that they would never make a soldier of me. The doctor then subjected me to a cursory medical examination, after which I was once again forcibly dressed and handcuffed.

On another occasion the officer referred to came into my cell, and looking at me said: "You b——y ape! I'm giving my life's blood for my country and the like of you." On yet another occasion he came to the cell and said: "I know what's wrong with you, Briggs; you have Labour tendencies." I said: "What if I have?" He asked: "Do you know what we are going to do with Labour after this war is over?" I said: "No; I don't pretend to know." He said: "We are going to finish them at the point of the bayonet. Do you know what I would do with you if I had my way? I would stand you with your back to the wall and riddle you with bullets." I quietly replied: "Why don't you do it?" Another day he came along with the adjutant and the regimental S.M. The officer ordered the handcuffs to be removed. Immediately this was done he ordered me to get fully dressed and go out on parade. While he was giving the order I was removing the khaki. The adjutant then explained the serious nature of the position I was placing myself in, and said he would give me another chance. Thereupon the order to get into full dress and parade was repeated. I told the officer I absolutely refused to obey the order. I was now re-dressed by force, and left in the cell handcuffed. That evening I was taken to the guard-room in front of the Colonel, and charged with disobeying an order. This Colonel insisted that I must address him as "Sir." I told him that if I had to choose between calling him "Sir" and never speaking again I would choose the latter alternative. He then asked me if I would accept a penalty from him, and I told him I would not. We (Baltantyne, Maguire and myself) were next brought up for "summary of evidence" prior to courtmartial, my two comrades having also refus-

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

ed to obey the order to dress and parade. We refused to make any statement by way of "summary," and heard nothing further.

On September 15 I had been sentenced to twenty-eight days' detention. This sentence expired on October 13, but I was still kept in solitary confinement, notwithstanding that I had no sentence. I remained in solitary until I was taken to France.

On one occasion when the officer ordered me to go out for exercise in charge of a military escort, and I refused, he threatened to put a rope around me and drag me behind a motor waggon. I told him that was the only way he would get me out. One Sunday morning he came and asked me if I would like to go to church. I said, "Yes." He then told me that to go to church I would have to get into full military dress. I told him that if that was all their religion amounted to I would stay away from church.

In front of three of us, and with a number of n.c.o.'s present, a quartermaster-sergeant once made an unprintable threat as to what he would do with the sister of a conscientious objector if he had the opportunity.

Nearing the end of the time we were in Wellington "clink," General Fulton visited us, and told me that it appeared to him there was a leader among the conscientious objectors, and immediately after this Ballantyne and Maguire were removed to other "clinks," and I was taken to Canterbury "clink." On arrival there I was handed over to a non-commissioned officer. The n.c.o. said: "Oh, this is the b——d, is it? We'll b——y soon tame you here. You can have it either hot or cold, whichever you like." I replied: "If that's so, it might as well be hot from the jump." Up to this time I was handcuffed with my hands in front, but this order was now reversed, and my hands were ironed behind me. I had had breakfast in the Wellington "clink" before leaving. Some time after I had been in the cell a sergeant came and asked me: "Do you want any b——y dinner?" I replied not if I had to look to the like of him for it. No dinner was brought to me. After dinner I was visited by an officer, who asked me how I was feeling. I replied: "As well as can be expected." The officer then asked the n.c.o. if I had had my food all right. The n.c.o. told him that I had only come in that morning and wouldn't have my dinner. The officer then asked me why this was so. I told him I could see through the methods that were being employed against me, that I had had twenty-three days' solitary confinement in Wellington "clink," and apparently the military police didn't regard that punishment as severe enough, and I had been shifted up there for the purpose of being bullied into being a soldier. I further told him that to prove to him and the rest of the military authorities that bullying was no good in my case, I would neither eat nor drink as long as I was left in that "clink." He threatened that if I did that they would forcibly feed me. I at once proceeded to put my promise into operation. For the first two or three days they didn't bring me any food;

MARK BRIGGS.

at meal times they would just come and ask if I wanted anything to eat, and on every occasion I said "No." I fought against the pangs of hunger in the daytime and at night slept soundly. During the latter part of the time food was placed in my cell regularly, but I never touched it. On every occasion that the dinner was brought in the handcuffs were removed, and also on every occasion that the handcuffs were taken off I removed the khaki, and was always forcibly re-dressed. The doctor came in day by day and took my pulse. After I had been some three days without food, the principal medical officer came in in addition to the ordinary doctor. He was very courteous, and endeavoured to tempt me with suggestions about drinks of hot milk, etc. I maintained the hunger strike from Tuesday morning until Saturday night—practically five days.

On the Saturday morning I was taken to the barber and shaved. About four in the afternoon they came and put putties on me, and also a pack on my shoulders, and took me out of the "clink." There I saw a medical officer, who again endeavoured to persuade me to have something to eat. I refused, and a Red Cross car was then brought round, and I was placed in this with an escort and a medical officer, and taken to the train, on which I was placed with a draft for France. This was towards the end of October.

We reached Salisbury Station at 7 p.m. and I had something to eat there with the guard. The men I travelled with were very friendly. We remained at Folkestone for a day or so, and then proceeded on to the boat for France. I was not ironed while being taken across to France, although some of the other conscientious objectors were taken across in irons. We landed at Boulogne, and remained there one night at what they called "One Blanket Hill." Next morning we were taken in motor lorries to Etaples, which was then the Base Camp.

When the newly-arrived troops were paraded, I refused to march with them, and Captain Wilford (son of the Honourable T. M. Wilford) peremptorily ordered some half-dozen men to carry me on to the parade ground. When they got me to the parade ground I merely sat down, and the order was then given by Wilford to take me away to the guard-room. At the guard-room I was told that after dinner I would be fully dressed and be taken down to the parade ground for Commanding Officer's inspection. I said in that case there would be someone with me, because I would not walk down there, neither would I carry the equipment. Eventually I was carried down by the military police. They had put the pack on me, and I just sat down, using the pack for a support until the rest of the draft had been inspected by Colonel Mitchell. The Colonel then walked over to where I was with the police, and ordered the removal of the pack, and also instructed that I was to be taken to his office as he wanted to talk to me. In his office he asked me to explain my attitude. I told him I was an anti-militarist deported from New Zealand, and that I would

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

undertake no military service whatever. He endeavoured to persuade me to change my mind, and in doing so was very fair and reasonable. He explained that, for the time being, I was under his charge, and that while I was there I would not be interfered with; but, he said, if he received instructions from the General to send me up the line he would have to obey, and if I refused duty when there I would be liable to be courtmartialled and shot.

I might mention that on one occasion a military officer of high rank, while endeavouring to persuade me to undertake military service, showed me what purported to be a list of soldiers who had been courtmartialled and some of whom had been shot for refusing to obey orders.

For three weeks I remained in the guard-room. At the end of the first fortnight I was again taken before Colonel Mitchell, who told me, he wanted to save me years of imprisonment, and offered me light work in the garden. I told him I would scorn to take any light job and thus be the means of sending the man already in that job where I was not prepared to go myself. A week later I was taken out of the "clink" and placed in a tent with the mess orderlies, and was told I would not be expected to work, but could knock about the camp. In this way I filled in a month, and then was approached and told I had to "go throughn gas." I refused to go, and was carried to the gas hut in a hand cart. A gas mask was placed on me, and I was taken into the gas hut by two men with gas masks on. I immediately pulled down the top of my mask. It was placed on me again, and I again tore it down; whereupon I was pulled outside and let go.

That night while in bed I was told I was to proceed "up the line" in the morning with a draft, and was asked if I would walk to the station. I replied: "Yes, conditionally." They asked what were the conditions, and I told them: "The conditions are that there is no rifle or hostile equipment to carry." Next morning when I got up I found outside the hut and pack, rifle and equipment, also a hand cart and fatigue party. They placed the pack on my shoulders and I sat down. I was then forcibly placed on the hand cart and taken to the railway station, and there put on the train for Popperinghe, where we landed considerably after dark that night. I left the railway truck and walked up to the camp, leaving behind in the train the rifle and other equipment. Next morning when I arose there were orders to proceed to Scottish lines. In the meantime my equipment had been brought from the station in the waggon sent for the officers' luggage and stores, etc. The pack was again put on me, and I refused to walk with it. I was then taken by the feet, and dragged head downwards some fifty yards to a tent. I was sent from here under escort to the Scottish Lines, where I was again placed in the guard-room. The n.c.o. here was a coloured man, and he came and told me I had to go out and parade that afternoon. I told him I was not going. The

MARK BRIGGS.

n.c.o. said: "If I can't take you out any other way, I'll take you on the point of the guards' bayonets." I did not go out on parade, however.

I was next interviewed by Colonel Blair, who asked me if I had a trade, and offered to give me any work about the camp for which I was fitted. I told him I was not taking on any military work whatever. I was then sent up in charge of a non-commissioned officer to the travelling cookers and ordered to peel potatoes. I again refused, and was duly charged with having disobeyed a lawful command. For this I was sentenced by Colonel Blair to twenty-eight days' Field Punishment No. 1. I was ordered to be taken from the Scottish Lines to the compound at Oudredoum to serve the sentence. The equipment was again placed on me, and, of course, I again refused to carry it and was dragged out of the "clink." Finally, when they recognised the hopelessness of getting me to carry the pack, they asked me if I would go without it, and I said I would. Then the pack was taken off, and we proceeded to the compound—about three or four miles away. Arriving there, the police in charge were told I was a conscientious objector, and wouldn't perform either military service or work. One of the military said: "We'll b——y well soon make you work." I said: "I don't think you will." He immediately ordered me to "grab a banjo" and go over and help fill sand bags. These sand bags were used to put around the bivouac to protect it from German bombs and shells. Refusing to obey, I was dragged over to one of the posts erected for the purpose, and was fastened to the post. I was, in fact, handcuffed to the post with my hands dragged round behind me, and my feet were also lashed to it with a rope. This was early in December, which is practically mid-winter in France. Needless to say, the cold was intense, and I suffered agonies during the hours I was left in this position. I remained tied up until dinner time, when I was released for the meal. After dinner I was tied up to the post again in the same way and left for at least two hours. This treatment was repeated for three days; then I was ordered to go to the compound cook-house and help the cook. Again I refused to obey and was taken up before the A.P.M. (chief officer of the military police), and was charged with refusing to work in the compound. He said: "I don't know what to do with you, but I think a long spell in a military jail would be a good remedy for you." I replied: "I don't think much of your remedy. No matter where you put me I will be just the same." He sentenced me to three days' confinement in the punishment cell. After I had served this sentence, I was ordered to do pack drill and refused. They then charged me with disobeying a lawful command, and got ready for a courtmartial.

That afternoon or the following day General Russell came to the compound, and ordered me to be taken out to see him. When I met him he took me aside, and, with Colonel Blair only present, he told

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

me that they had come to the conclusion that I was honest and sincere in my attitude. "If you were in Germany," he said, "they would shoot you. But we are not going to do that here. What's more, we are not going to use German methods on you. I am going to release you unconditionally, and send you up to the stores at Cafe Belles for a month. You will go up there, and no one whatever will interfere with you. At the end of the month I will see you again and ascertain if you have changed your mind. You know, Briggs," he concluded, "you are fighting for freedom; so am I. But I use different methods from you. Your methods may be right, or they may be wrong. Mine may be right, or they may be wrong. I didn't hold the same ideas when I was your age as I hold to-day." I went to Cafe Belles and was there for a month, receiving very fair treatment. Then the stores were shifted to another district. The morning after I landed there I was taken over to see Brigadier-General Hart, and he asked me what General Russell had said when he released me from the compound. I told him, and he said: "And you haven't changed your mind yet?" I said: "No, and not likely to." He said he wasn't going to try to make me, and sent me back to the stores, where I remained until some weeks later, when Colonel Stuart came to succeed General Hart. Stuart sent for me, and said: "Well, Briggs, I have never met you before, but I have heard a good deal about you. Colonel Mitchell was up here yesterday, and we were talking your case over. You won't work, and I don't know what they sent you from New Zealand for. You are costing the New Zealand Government over £1 for every day you are in France." I remarked that I wasn't getting much of it anyhow. He asked me about my position in New Zealand and my relatives, and also wanted to know if I was prepared to subscribe towards a hospital in New Zealand when I got back. I refused to make any promise, and he told me to return to the stores for a few days, when I should hear from him.

Not long after this time General Godley visited the place, and his coming was followed by a remarkable change in my treatment. I could not help associating the change with Godley's influence, for, a few days after his appearance, I was sent for by Colonel Stuart, who, with a military brusqueness that may have been real or assumed, told me that I was to be sent 1500 yards behind the lines to work, and that if I didn't work I'd take the consequences. I was accordingly sent—along with Archie Baxter and Kirwan, accompanied by military police—to a camp called Belgian Chateau.

A military police sergeant was in charge of us. The first night Baxter, Kirwan and myself were left together in a hut. Next morning I was taken away, and a captain tried to induce the other two to go to work. Then he came and told me they had consented to work—which was not true. He said he really wanted me to work, and would give me a written statement to the effect that I wasn't doing military work. I refused to entertain the suggestion. He then said:

MARK BRIGGS.

"You're a b——y rotter, and I'll make it hot for you. You've had a pretty rough time, but you're at the last jump. The military policy now is either to make or break you." I retorted: "You might break me, but you'll never make me."

I was kept at this place for three days and handed bully beef and biscuits and water, after which I was despatched to Otago Camp (which lay about a mile to the right of all that was left of Ypres township). On my arrival there I was first put in a hut, and was next sent for by a captain, who said: "You're sent up here to work, Briggs, and work you will. To-morrow morning you'll put on equipment, take a rifle, go out on parade, and up on the working party the same as any other man." The captain put plenty of military bluff into his demeanour. "If the Hun comes over," he said, "you'll use the rifle the same as any other man." I replied: "Never as long as you live will I carry a rifle and equipment up there." He said: "Well, you'll go up without it for a few days; then you'll go up with it afterwards." I replied: "I won't go up in any case." He said. "You'll go up all right." I said: "I may, but if I do it will be in an extraordinary position."

Next morning I was sitting on the floor of the hut when the captain came in, and asked if I was going up. I said: "No." He kicked me twice, and then called in four soldiers and told them to take me up. "Get him there," he said, "no matter how, so long as you get him there." The soldiers seized me and carried me part of the way, and I was taken the rest of the way on a limber. I explained my attitude to the men who took me, and they were friendly enough. That afternoon I went back to Otago Camp.

On the following morning the captain came in again, this time bringing the military police sergeant with him. The captain again asked if I was going up, and I replied, "No." The police sergeant then grabbed me by the wrists and dragged me out on my back to the parade ground, where three soldiers were waiting. The military policeman asked: "Is there any rope about?" and immediately went to look for it himself. He found a long piece of cable wire, and, coming forward, fastened it around my chest immediately under my arms. The m.p. and the soldiers then harnessed themselves to the wire, and went off up the "duck-walk" (a footpath constructed of planks with battens nailed across at short intervals, to obviate the difficulty of the soldiers traversing the mud). Along this track—as far as I could judge, a distance of about a mile—I was dragged on my back. In the process the buttons were torn off my clothes, which were dragged away, and consequently my back was next to the "duck walk." The result was that I sustained a huge flesh wound about a foot long and nine inches wide on the right back hip and thigh. The track crossed the edge of an old shell crater, which was full of water, and when the soldiers reached it they stopped. The m.p. asked: "Are you going to walk now? Because if you're not,

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

you're going into this shell hole." I replied I didn't know where I was going, but I wasn't going to walk up there, anyway. He immediately threw me into the shell hole, and dragged me through the water, and along the ground to the next shell crater, and by means of the long wire again pulled me through the water. When they got me out on to the bank at the other side, they just picked me up by the shoulders and tipped me head over heels back into the water. When I came upright with my feet at the bottom, the water was over my shoulders. The m.p. said: "Drown yourself now, you b——d, if you want to die for your cause. You haven't got your Paddy Webbs and your Bob Semples to look after you now." They pulled me out, and dragged me along the ground to yet another shell hole, and they pulled me through this in the same way. After which I was dragged another hundred yards or so, when they stopped, and the m.p. asked me if they took me back to camp and gave me a change of clothes over a fire would I walk up afterwards.

By this time I was absolutely exhausted, and was shaking all over as the result of shock to the system. I replied: "I'll never walk up there as long as I draw breath." The sergeant then asked if I would walk back to the camp, and I replied that I would. I made an attempt to get up, but the task was impossible. Two of the soldiers, seeing that I was incapable of walking, lifted me with my arms over their shoulders, and in this way they carried me along with my feet dragging. Half way along I had to ask to be put down, because I was suffering unendurably from the effects of my treatment, and also from the manner in which I was being got along. The m.p. replied: "Keep the b——d going." Eventually they got me to the camp, and put me back in the hut from which I had been taken in the morning. They divested me of my clothing—which was all wet and muddy, and which I was not permitted to see again—and gave me a rough rub over with a dry towel, and then put a fresh shirt and pants on me, after which they covered me with blankets, placing a couple of mattresses on top of the blankets. This apparently was to get warmth into my body. There was only one thickness of blanket under me, however. They left me for about an hour and a half, when a non-commissioned officer brought me a drink of tea, and asked me if I intended to put my name down for sick parade. I replied: "No, I will not parade before any military doctor." He said he would bring a doctor to see me, as I was not fit to be left there. The m.p. visited me after the corporal had gone, and asked: "Will you be ready for a repetition of that treatment after dinner?" I replied: "If necessary."

The soldiers arrived back about 2.30 in the afternoon, and when they saw me on the floor covered with mattresses and blankets, they asked: "What's wrong, digger?" I replied: "They knocked me about a bit this morning." One of the men who had taken part in dragging me (and who belonged to the hut) told the others just what had happened. They asked him why he had done it. He replied: "I had

MARK BRIGGS.

taken the oath as a soldier, and was threatened with courtmartial if I refused to do it, and I had also been told that the extreme penalty was death for refusing duty on the battlefield, and I wasn't the bit of stuff to refuse." The soldiers expressed intense indignation about the action of the m.p., and threatened that they would take his life. The m.p. kept out of the way that evening. Next morning when he was crossing the parade ground the camp cooks (nine or ten in number) came out and counted him out. I could hear the, "One, two," etc., and the medical orderly told me what was happening.

The doctor came about four in the afternoon of the day on which I was injured. He came into the hut with a medical orderly, removed the mattresses and blankets, and also removed my clothing sufficiently to permit him to see my back. When he saw the extent of my injuries he uttered an exclamation of surprise and anger, and told two men in the hut to get a stretcher and take me to the R.A.P. hut. They removed me there, and the doctor at once examined me, and ordered my back to be bathed with warm water. He told them: "Get as much of the dirt out of his back as you can. You won't get it all out because it it ground right into the flesh. You will have to dress his back and send him right away to the hospital."

The doctor then went away, leaving the orderly to carry out his instructions. He returned about half an hour later, and a bed was made up on a stretcher for me that evening. I was not, however, taken to the hospital. Next day a bunk was brought in, and I was placed in this, and so remained for two weeks. During the first week I suffered indescribable agony; on certain nights I did not sleep at all because of the burning sensation of the flesh wound. The only time I left my bed was to get out to the latrines; it was with the utmost pain and difficulty that I could move about, and whenever I left the bed I returned exhausted. By the end of the fortnight I could get out for half-an-hour at a time, when I would saunter slowly up and down the "duck walk" and then return to bed.

The hut I was in was right in the line of fire. Shells flew over the camp and lodged a mile away.

In due time orders came to move camp from Ypres sector to the Somme. This meant the transfer of all the soldiers. Two miles from the Otago Camp was a light railway used to convey the troops, and the doctor asked me if I could walk this distance. I agreed to make the attempt, and succeeded with great difficulty. I was taken by rail to near Abele. When I reached this rest camp, the sergeant-major asked me what was the matter with me. I replied that I didn't feel too good. He said: "You look b--- y near dead."

Here I met Archie Baxter, who had come down on the same train. The medical hut equipment failed to arrive, and I found myself without blankets that night. Archie Baxter offered me one of his.

I was along with Archie Baxter next morning when a captain came in and ordered Baxter out on parade with his full pack up.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Baxter refused to obey, whereupon the captain used unprintable language and attacked Baxter, striking him with his fists and knocking him down, and then kicked him while on the ground. The officer next lifted him from the floor and again struck him, knocking him down again. Following on this incident, Baxter was taken away to the Somme. This attack by the officer happened after Baxter's letter to his parents was written, and before he was placed in the mental hospital. That was the last I saw of Archie Baxter.

After that I was sent to Abele for medical treatment, and, on my arrival, the doctor was sent for, and saw me at the medical hut. He ordered me to report there next morning—which I did. Every morning thereafter I had my back dressed at the medical hut. I was kept here for about a month, and during that time was twice sent before Medical Boards. At Abele I found Captain Mitchell in charge. At this time I was bent double, and couldn't straighten myself. Colonel Mitchell had me brought before him, and said: "They knocked you about at Ypres?" I replied: "Yes, a bit." He answered: "Yes, I think a good bit by the look of you." He remarked that I would not be well for a good while yet, and then asked me what I intended to do when I got right again. I answered: "Carry on the same as usual." He suggested that I was foolish, and asked if I didn't think I would be better doing some light job instead of "getting up against it." I replied that I couldn't help that.

Here I learned for the first time that Ballantyne, Little and Baxter had each been sentenced to five years' imprisonment with hard labour, and that their sentences had been commuted to two years. I also learned that Archie Baxter was taken to the Somme without Colonel Mitchell's knowledge. Had the Colonel known what was being done I am certain he would have tried to prevent it.

I was next returned to Etaples with a few others for the Final Medical Board. On the paper sent down with me my complaint was set down as a form of rheumatism. I went before the Board, and Dr. Marks said they would treat me for my complaint and patch me up for a Base job. I told him: "I wouldn't do a Base job when I was fit and well, and I am sure I am not going to do it now." He then said they would give me treatment and see what they could do for me. After this I was taken before Major Bowerbank, who asked me what I had been doing while I was up the line. I told him "Nothing." He then asked me how I got into the condition I was in, and I told him of the treatment I had received at Ypres six weeks earlier, and showed him the scar of the flesh wound on my back.

I was under medical treatment at Etaples for three weeks, at the end of which time they told me that they could do nothing more for me—that rest was the only thing that would do me any good. By the Medical Board I was classed C2, P.B. 3—which meant the lowest category in which they could place me to keep me in either France or England. I remained practically crawling around the camp for a

MARK BRIGGS.

fortnight; and then, when coming out of the cookhouse with Harland one night, a non-commissioned officer said to me: "Be here at half-past four; they have you on a P.B. draft for up the line again." I insisted on being taken before a doctor, and was taken to the medical hut, where I saw Major Bowerbank. He asked me what was wrong, and I told him that I had just been told that I was to proceed up the line with a draft. I asked him to say whether I was fit to even walk to the station without a pack. The pack and rifle were already done up waiting for me. The Major told me to go back to my tent; and I heard no more about being sent up the line.

I was next sent along to Chaplain-Captain Green (Salvation Army), who wanted to put me on washing down the inside of the Salvation Army hut. I told him that if there was any work attached to it "it was a wash-out," as I would refuse to do any military work. Green argued that it would not be military work. I pointed out that men paid five shillings a day by the military were already doing it. In the end, the Salvation Army officer called me into his room, and said: "I can't understand you fellows." I said: "I am very well aware of that; otherwise you wouldn't be in the position you're in now." He began to show signs of anger, and declared that 75 per cent of the Conscientious Objectors were shirkers and wasters, but added that he believed there were a few who were genuine, and further conceded that he thought I was one of the genuine Conscientious Objectors, because of what I had gone through for the sake of my principles. When he found I wouldn't work he told me to report back to the orderly room and tell them I wouldn't do it. I didn't bother reporting back—I was aware that when the order was given it was known that I would not obey it.

I was next sent for by Major Bowerbank, who, as soon as I entered the medical hut, asked what work I could do. I replied I could do no military work whatever, and very little of any other, even if I wished to. He said he knew that. "I would send you home tomorrow, if I had my way," he told me; "but I haven't the power to do it." This notwithstanding that he was President of the Final Medical Board. "You have either to do a Base job or go up the line again," he added. I replied: "There is one thing certain. I won't do a Base job; and if the other is the only alternative it will be up the line." He replied: "All right, then," and I returned to the hut. He then sent Harland to ask me if I would do certain work at the Y.M.C.A. hut. I replied, "No," and Harland went back and told him I wouldn't do the job. Harland told me later that the Major said he might have known from what I had said previously that I wouldn't do the work. Harland also told me that Bowerbank added: "I didn't wait for you to come back, but went over to see the Commanding Officer (Major Dovey), and we have decided to leave Briggs's case until we can see General Richardson. He is practically a C2 man, but, so far, he has done no military work. If he took on a job in

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

camp and broke down on it I could send him back." A few days later Harland told me that Major Bowerbank had seen General Richardson, and that I was to be sent to England in a fortnight or three weeks' time.

While I was waiting for the order to proceed to England, Mr. Massey and Sir Joseph Ward visited Etaples, and I heard no more about the trip to England; but, a little later, a non-commissioned officer came to me while I was lying in bed, and told me: "They have you down on a gas stunt to-day, Briggs; I don't know how you will get on." This meant walking about six miles in all, and undergoing a gas test. I replied: "I know how I will get on. In the first place, I'm not fit to go. In the second place, I'm not going; and if the military authorities insist on me going they'll have to drag me every inch of the way, because I will not try to walk. By what I can see of them, they want the last drop of blood out of a man before they will be satisfied, and if they do, let them take it." I heard no more about the "gas stunt."

I was next sent for by Colonel McKenzie (who had now succeeded Major Dovey). He asked me: "What are you doing in camp?" I replied: "Nothing." He said: "You've been here five months, haven't you?" I replied: "Yes, roughly speaking." He said: "What do you think of yourself drawing Government pay and eating Government food and doing nothing for it?" I said: "Government pay? I never drew a sixpence from the Army in my life." He said: "Well, you eat the food. Will you be prepared to pay for that when you get back to New Zealand?" I replied: "No; I want you to understand I was dragged from New Zealand and deported. I consider the least they can do is to feed me while I am away—and they've done that very poorly at times." The Colonel then said: "Oh, well, I am not going to discuss your ideas. I am here to decide whether you are fit to go up the ditches or not." He added that he was satisfied that I was not fit to go up the line, and urged that if I would take a light job in camp it would not be so bad. "But," he said, "you won't work." I replied: "No." He said: "If I were to send you to Blighty it would be the same?" I said: "Exactly." He then asked me if he sent me back to New Zealand, what was the first thing I'd do on arrival there. I told him that I'd first have a rest. He then wanted to know what was the first thing I'd do after I had had a rest. I said: "Supervise my own business."

The following week I saw Colonel Mitchell, who said it was time I was sent back to England, and that he would see that I was sent back. A week later I was sent with a draft from France to Torquay. I arrived at Torquay on Sunday, and on Monday morning I was taken to headquarters, when an officer asked me for my name and number. I gave him my name, and told him I hadn't got a number. He demanded to see my pay-book, and I told him I had none. He then asked me how long it was since I had left New Zealand, and I told

MARK BRIGGS.

him twelve months last July. He then asked how I had got on for money, and I replied I had never had any money from the military. He said: "I think you are telling a pack of b——y lies." He then instructed the n.e.o. to write to the Records Office in London, and inform them that they had a man there who told them he had left New Zealand twelve months last July and had never had any money, off them or a pay-book. Addressing me he said: "This is no place for you. We'll d——n soon have you out of this."

I was then sent back to Wellington District Camp, at Granville Mansions, and remained there ten days in the house and garden, and never went outside. While in the garden there I was ordered by a Lieutenant Tipping to go on parade, and refusing, was sent by Tipping's orders to the guard-room. Two days after I was taken before a Major and charged with refusing to go on parade. I was asked if I still refused to go on parade, and replied: "Yes." I was then remanded, and afterwards told by the m.p. that I had been remanded for a "summary of evidence." I was held in the guard-room for another ten days or so, when General Richardson came in with Major Kaye one evening about seven. The General asked me what I was doing in there, and I replied that I was a Conscientious Objector. He asked me what I was there for, and I told him for refusing to go on parade. He questioned me about my experiences in France, and I gave him in detail the account of what I had undergone. "Join the medical corps," he said, "and I'll wash your crimes out." I replied: "No; I'll join nothing in this outfit." It is needless for me to add that I didn't concede that I had any "crimes" that needed washing out. It was rather the other way about as between the military and myself.

The next day the m.p. had instructions to take me to Major Kaye (Commanding Officer of Torquay), who said he wished to talk to me as man to man, not as officer to man. He questioned me about my religious beliefs, and I assured him that although I had been brought up a Wesleyan Methodist, I did not base my objection to military service on religious grounds. I explained that I was an anti-militarist. He asked me what would have happened if everybody had been like me and German Militarism had been allowed to run over us. I replied that if everybody had been like me there would have been no war. I added that I reckoned that I personally had had German Militarism over me from the first day the red-caps put a hand on me in New Zealand. I pointed out to him that one of the strongest arguments used in securing volunteers from New Zealand was that their mission was to end German Militarism, but, unfortunately (I told him), the thing they asked the New Zealand soldiers to end in Germany was the very thing they were establishing behind the soldiers' backs in New Zealand. He finished up by saying that my ideals were all right, but that they were impracticable.

Eventually I was sent to a farm at Mortonhamstead, and remained

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

there for a month. I was then sent back to Torquay for further medical treatment, and, after a week there, was recommended to be returned to New Zealand at the first opportunity.

About three weeks after my return to Torquay I was placed on board the Ruapeha, and made the return trip to New Zealand without incident of any moment.

On my arrival in Wellington Harbour, I refused to take either money or discharge when we were lined up prior to disembarkation. I "fell out," and was called back by a non-commissioned officer, and taken before the Commanding Officer of the boat and a shore officer, and these made an effort to persuade me to take the discharge papers. I refused, basing my refusal on the fact that I had never been a soldier, and, therefore, needed neither money nor discharge. The officer from ashore then asked the boat Commanding Officer if he had a guard. The Commanding Officer said: "No; but I can soon get one." The shore officer then said to me: "We'll have to put you under open arrest." I said: "If that's the penalty for refusing military pay and papers, you'd better do it, because I have no intention of taking them." I was then told to consider myself under open arrest, and as I walked away one officer said to the other: "We can put him under close arrest before he gets to the wharf."

About two hours later I was told that the Commanding Officer of the boat wanted to see me, and when I got down the Commanding Officer took me to Brigadier-General Andrews, who had come on board. When I went into the room General Andrews said: "Well, Briggs, there seems to be some difficulty in disposing of you." I said: "None as far as I am concerned." Andrews then asked me: "Well, what was the trouble this morning?" "Merely," I replied, "that they offered me military papers and money and a discharge, and I wouldn't take them." "Well," he said, "yours is a peculiar case. What do you think we should do with you when we land you on the wharf?" I said: "I don't consider you should do anything with me." He then wanted to know how I would get on for money and my return ticket to Palmerston North. I told him that I should have friends to meet me on the wharf. "If we put you on the wharf without your military papers," he said, "you will be liable to be asked for them and arrested if you haven't got them. Can you suggest a way out of the difficulty?" I suggested that he could furnish me with a formal discharge which wouldn't require my signature. I told him I would sign nothing. He then said to the Commanding Officer of the ship: "This man is not under arrest, is he?" and the Commanding Officer said, "No." General Andrews then said to me: "All right, Briggs; I'll depend on your word of honour that you won't go ashore until you've seen me. Come down here after the soldiers have gone ashore and I'll fix you up."

After the soldiers had gone ashore, I went below, but the General wasn't there. I saw another officer, and he advised me to go ashore

MARK BRIGGS.

and return in the morning. I left the ship in a disreputable old khaki suit, and was met by my brother, Mr. and Mrs. Ballantyne, Mr. Peter Fraser, M.P., Mrs. Aitken, Mr. Jack Hughes, and others. I put the evening in with my friends after getting into decent civilian clothes, and returned to the boat next morning. I went to the office and saw a shore officer, who exclaimed: "It didn't take you long to get into civvy clothes!" I failed to see General Andrews, but one of the officers answered my inquiries: "Oh, well, you're as much a civilian now as ever you were. Your discharge is being made out and will be posted to you." Thereupon I left the boat, and in due time returned to my friends and business at Palmerston North.

In a few days a registered letter from the military, addressed to me, arrived at the Palmerston North Post Office. A girl clerk clears the P.O. box daily for my firm, but for this letter the girl's signature was refused. She was told that I would have to take delivery of the letter personally. When I called at the Post Office, I was asked for my regimental number, and told the postmaster I had no number. "Then," he said, "this letter cannot be for you." I had made up my mind not to give the military authorities my signature, and, of course, the postal people's view of things suited me. So I came away, and the letter is still at the Post Office—if it has not been returned to the Defence Department.

(Signed) MARK BRIGGS.

XVI.—ARCHIBALD McC. L. BAXTER.

My object in writing this statement is not to parade my opinions or principles. Neither do I write it as a complaint against the Army, for I believe complaints, as a rule, do little good. My object is an honest one. I wish to make a plain statement of facts which may prove of some value, and if much of which I have to relate discredits me in the minds of some people, the public has at least an honest, if incomplete, statement to judge from, and I might say here at the outset, that I have nothing to conceal, and, from my point of view, nothing to be ashamed of. I have often been asked, "What are my objections to war?" and the argument of the "survival of the fittest" has often been used in support of military methods. I have wondered that educated men can be so illogical, for while this law may be natural enough throughout the animal kingdom, in war it is not the "fittest" who survive, but a great many of the world's fittest and best men are slain, while a still greater number are rendered unfit. I am against war on this ground, and I wonder that any sane person who knows the destruction, the degradation, the misery, and the sorrow

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

caused by war, can regard it as anything else than diabolical in the extreme. Now I have always been a true believer in law and order, and as a citizen I have regard for the thoughts and opinions of my fellows, and also for their feelings. I believe that a man should seek to bring his life and actions into agreement with his truest sense of duty towards God and Man. I believe that the Soul of Man is not, and cannot be, subject to any earthly State, for no earthly State is perfect. For this the military authorities designated me a "Defiant Objector" in New Zealand, but in France they told me that they believed me sincere, although I had not changed my opinions. I believe that passive resistance to evil is the power that will yet conquer the world, and I believe that that form of militarism that goes on the principle that Man is merely the property of Man, will find that there are men who will oppose such principles, though they be subjected to the most barbarous cruelties, or put to death, or shut in cells and bound with all the chains and fetters that were ever forged on the anvils of Hell. I am not against the soldier; the troops I came in contact with know that. I judge no man for his opinions. I have my failings like other men, but I stand for Universal Brotherhood. I view all men as comrades and brothers in different stages of moral, intellectual, and spiritual development, and I know that far above all earthly States is to be found the awakened Soul of Man struggling onward and upward, away from long cherished delusions towards that universal harmony which to know in its fullness would be perfect comprehension, freedom, and love.

I was arrested at my home in Brighton by the local policeman in company with another officer. I had not received notice to go into camp, and had just returned home from a hard season's shearing. The local police officer said he had come to see me on business relating to farming statistics, and I walked with him a short distance from the house, where his friend appeared, and I was informed that I was under arrest. I asked for permission to go into the house for my clothes, and when this was refused, I asked the officer to come in with me, or go in himself, but he refused, and ordered me into his cart. My mother then brought out my hat and coat and I was driven off. I was taken to the Kensington Drill Hall, and from there was marched down to the Central Battery by four guards with fixed bayonets, and was there locked in a cell. Next day I was sent to Trentham Camp, and was there charged before the Camp Commandant with being absent without leave. The case against me was dismissed, but I was not set at liberty. I was kept a prisoner in company with William Little, my brother John, and some others in the "clink." After a few days, my brother Alex. was brought in, and we were then sentenced to twenty-eight days' detention for refusing our kits. When we arrived at the Detention Barracks at Wellington, we were put on bread and water for three days for refusing to take

ARCHIBALD McC. L. BAXTER.

off our civilian clothes and change into denims. We were afterwards charged before a courtmartial (and got three months' jail for the same offence. We were taken back to Trentham when our time was up, and were sentenced to another twenty-eight days' detention. We were sent again to the Wellington Detention Barracks, where we were asked if we intended to take off our clothes this time. We replied that we did not, and no further pressure was used. We were locked in our cell most of the time for about a fortnight, when early one morning we were marched out by about a dozen military police. We were put on board a transport, and when we were put into the guard-room on board we met ten other Objectors who had been put on board during the night. I had met most of these men in jail, and they were pleased to meet us again. There were then fourteen of us in all. The thing we felt most at the time was not being allowed to bid our friends good-bye. We were kept in that guard-room, and most of us being sick, we were in a bad way for some time, but afterwards, by the Captain's orders, I think, we were taken out on deck for fresh air, and were also given a chance to keep our quarters clean.

Before we reached Capetown many of those on board were down with measles, and about twenty men, including Albert Sanderson, my brother John and myself, were put ashore at this port. I saw no more of the other Objectors till I met some of them in France, except Robert Gray, whom I met at Sling Camp. He was doing gardening work there at the time. Gray told me that he and his comrades had been stripped of their clothes a few days after their ship left Capetown. He said that their clothes were thrown overboard and that they were pulled out naked and had had the hose turned on them. When we were put ashore at Capetown I was sent to the military hospital at Maitland in company with others, my brother and Sanderson being sent to another hospital.

After about three weeks we were all gathered up again and sent to the Castle at Capetown. We remained there for some weeks, and no men could have been more friendly than the troops who were with us there. The lieutenant in charge was a New Zealander, but had not been in New Zealand for twenty years. He told me that all he would ask of my brother and I was to answer the roll call. Sanderson had been sentenced to a term of imprisonment in New Zealand, and as his time had not yet expired he was sent to a military prison in Weinberg. All the rest of us were sent after this to Simons-town. My brother and I were in civilian clothes and were at absolute freedom. Our stay there did us a great amount of good. A band of us used to go out each day exploring the country, and we saw many interesting things—things that were new to us in plant and animal life. I was sorry that Sanderson was confined to a prison cell while we roved out at will, through scenes of the most wonderful rugged beauty. Altogether we spent about three and a half months there,

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

and if we had any wish to escape from the army we had nothing to do but to walk away, but that would have been against our principles.

My brother, Sanderson and I left Capetown with the other New Zealanders on a passenger ship, the Llanstephen Castle. There were about nine hundred negroes on board, who were being sent out by the South African Government to work behind the lines in France. We had a good enough time on the voyage and were not made prisoners, but had complete freedom. Sanderson became ill, and was so far down at one time that I thought he would never reach England. No men could have been more friendly than those New Zealanders who were with us at Capetown and on the voyage to England.

When we arrived at Plymouth we were lined up on the wharf, and a British officer came along and asked, "Who are these men in civilian clothes?" When he was told he said he did not know what to do about us, and went away to find out. When he came back he sent us along with the other men to Sling Camp. For some time after arriving at Sling Camp I was at liberty. I was still wearing civilian clothes, which I refused to give up, but eventually they were taken away from me forcibly and I was then dressed in uniform. I was put in detention for refusing orders, and each day I was taken out by the Military Police for exercise, always handcuffed, with my hands behind my back. I was also handcuffed in the same way while in my cell. It was snowy weather, and for want of circulation I could hardly move a limb. I was suffering from neuralgia and protested against such treatment. I think it was the only time I ever did complain in the Army. The Military Police said it was the adjutant's orders, but that they would see the provost-sergeant. The latter came in and took the handcuffs off and told me to come out into the guard-room and have a warm at the fire. I have nothing to say against the military police at Sling. I heard the adjutant's orders, which were that if I did not choose to promise obedience I could freeze."

Almost every day I was visited by officers and sometimes by a chaplain. They argued with me sometimes for hours at a stretch. One parson told me that he was very much interested and glad that he had met me. He had heard about me, and had evidently expected to meet a crank or an egotist, who had no regard for any law, human or divine. He talked with me for a long time, and told me that he agreed with me on most points, but that his views were not so extreme. He offered to do anything in his power for me, and promised to call and see me again.

After this, the colonel and the adjutant paid me another visit, and informed me that I was being sent to France with the next draft. I was glad to hear this, for I knew that my comrades were there, and I hoped to meet them again. They told me that if I went along quietly with the other soldiers I would be all right. They asked me if I would do this, and I replied that I realised that I was in their power, and that they could send me wherever they wished.

ARCHIBALD McC. L. BAXTER.

When the draft was ready to start, the sergeant, the military police, and a few soldiers who knew me shook hands with me, and wished me the best of luck. They asked me what I would do when I reached France, and I replied: "They can send me to France, they can send me into the trenches or anywhere they like. All that I can conscientiously do I will do, but what I cannot conscientiously do I'll refuse to do, no matter what the consequences." They cheered, and I was then taken out and attached to the draft and sent off.

Next day I arrived at Etaples, and there met Patton and Harland. Patton told me he had been in a compound for twenty-eight days for refusing orders, and had been punched by a guard while in prison. He had been on No. 1 Field Punishment. At the time of which I write both Patton and Harland were at liberty, and I remained with them about two days, and during this time had my freedom.

I was then taken before Colonel Mitchell. He said that I was to proceed to Abele with a draft, and that he would be up there in a few days, and would see me there.

I went with the draft, and when we reached Abele I was put in a hut with the other troops, and in the morning was given an order, which I refused to obey. I was then left for a few days until Colonel Mitchell arrived. I was taken before him several times for about a week. He said he did not wish to send me to "clink," but that he could not leave me among the other troops. He gave me into the charge of the military police, and told me to remain with the police for the time being. I stayed with the police in their quarters for some time, and was allowed a certain amount of freedom. The police were very friendly, and I was well treated by them.

Colonel Mitchell had told me that he would look into my case, and see if he could do anything for me. The next time I was called before him he told me that he had done all in his power for me, and that if I did not obey orders he could not do other than treat me as any other soldier who disobeys; that I was regarded as a soldier by the N.Z. Government. I explained my attitude, and he said that he very much regretted to have to punish me, but if I did not obey his hand would be forced.

I was then taken and given an order, which I refused. I was taken before him again, and was sentenced to twenty-eight days' No. 1 Field Punishment. Next day I was taken to a compound, where I received orders from the sergeant, which I again refused. I was then reported to the officer in charge, who told me that he would have to tie me up, but he hated to have to do this to any man, and was not doing it to other prisoners. I remained there for about a week, but was not tied up. An officer came to the compound and had a conversation with me, and said that I should not be permitted to live. I was then taken out of that compound and sent to another called Mud Farm. The men there were being tied up, whether they obeyed orders or not. This compound was in charge of a lieutenant

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

of the Imperial Forces and a N.Z. sergeant. After I had been there for a few days, tied up three hours each day, Kirwan was brought in under escort and put in a tent in the same enclosure with me. There were a good many prisoners there, but only one New Zealander beside Kirwan and myself. Kirwan had been sentenced for the second time to twenty-eight days' No. 1 Field Punishment for refusing orders. While doing the first term he had been put in close confinement for a time on biscuits and water. While we were there we received the same food as the other prisoners. It kept our body and soul together. The weather became very cold and rough. The poles on which we were tied were in a very exposed place by the roadside, in view of the passers-by. The other prisoners were not tied up in all weathers, but Kirwan and I were. On one occasion we were tied there in a bitter snowstorm. I was too numbed to feel when taken off, and suffered much from the effects.

We were both taken from this place back to Abele, where we were again taken before Colonel Mitchell, who said that as we still refused orders there was no alternative but to send us up the lines, and also pointed out to us what it would mean if we refused to obey orders under fire. He told me that he thought at one time that I might change my mind, and I replied that he judged me wrongly, that I was quite sure of the ground on which I stood. He said he was sorry if he had judged me wrongly, but thought it most regrettable that I should take up such an attitude.

We were then equipped with steel helmet and gas mask, and given into charge of a provost sergeant. We were taken from place to place behind the lines all that day, and stopped that night at a place where we met Mark Briggs. On the morning after Kirwan and I arrived there we were taken before a colonel, in company with Briggs. This colonel told us that he was sending us up the lines, and if we disobeyed orders we would have to stand the consequences. Prior to going up before him, I was given an order by the provost-sergeant in charge of us, which order I refused. He instantly dealt me a blow in the jaw, which knocked me down. Each time I tried to rise he struck me again. When I had got up the last time he had gone out of the hut. When I saw him again I asked him if he had anything personal against me, but he said he had not; he had his orders and intended to carry them out. I told him that was all I wished to know.

From there we proceeded with the provost-sergeant to the Belgian Chateau near the old town of Ypres. Kirwan, Briggs and I were then taken before an officer. This officer told us what he thought of us, and asked me why it was that I had refused to obey orders. When I replied, he complained of my want of modesty in setting forth my objections, and for saying that I would stand firm on my convictions and to the truth as I knew it, no matter what happened to me. I answered that he had spoken freely to me, and that I might as well

ARCHIBALD McC. L. BAXTER.

speak frankly and honestly—that I had certainly no wish to give offence. He also spoke to Briggs, and then dismissed us. We were then taken to a hut, and told to stay there until further orders. We were next brought before a captain, who received us one at a time. When I was taken in before him he said he wanted me to realise my position in the Army. He said that I was not justifying my existence. I told him why I objected and why I refused orders, and he said that the trouble was that none of the fourteen men who had been forcibly sent out of N.Z. could claim to be conscientiously opposed to war, at least not lawfully, as they did not belong to denominations in the tenets of whose creed war is forbidden. He signed a document and gave it to me, and sent me to another Camp. This document stated that I was not under military control. He sent a runner with me, who took me to this Camp and presented me to Headquarters there. They took my name, and gave me to understand that I was attached to the Battalion. I presented the document the captain gave me and they took a copy of it, and said that they would wait till they saw the captain. He came to the Camp later in the day, and told me that I could do anything I chose; that I could start when I liked and stop when I liked, and that I would not be under any military control whatever, as the document stated. He said that I would not be asked to do anything that would be against my conscience. When I asked whose control I would be under, he said that I would be under his own private control. I told him I had been attached to the Battalion as soon as I arrived there. He said that they should not have attached me, and asked me if I had shown them the document he had I realised that everything there was under military direction, and given me. I told him that I had presented it, and I also said that that the paper he had given me was absolutely worthless to me if any other officer was put in his place. He said he had looked on me before as a fanatic, but that henceforth he would regard me as an absolute obstructionist, and that he would rather see me with my skull knocked in behind a parapet than that I should ever see New Zealand again. I said: "Well, sir, I think you are very uncharitable and unjust, for I have no such wish towards you." He said: "Well, at any rate you are not much better than the men who are being sent to jail in New Zealand." I said that I had no doubt that they were sending better men than me to jail. He said that he had instructions from Headquarters regarding us, and that he wished to warn me. He said that these instructions were very harsh, and that if I did not listen to reason violence was sure to be used against me. I told him that violence had already been used against me, and that I was prepared for whatever was in store for me. He then sent me back to the camp I had just left, the Belgian Chateau.

When I got there the provost-sergeant came to the hut I was in and told me I was to get no food until I promised to obey orders. I remained there for three days without food. I was not locked up, but

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

he told me I was not allowed to draw my rations there, and I did not ask for anything except once, when I asked the orderly in the sergeants' mess if he had any tea left over. He told me there was some, and said to help myself, as he was not allowed to give me anything. I took some tea in a tin, but the provost-sergeant came up at the time, grabbed it out of my hand, and emptied the contents. Next day the cook called me over to the dug-out and gave me some food. He gave me food the next day also, and the sergeant did not interfere.

Next day I was sent back to the Otago Camp, and remained there. About two days after, an officer came to me and said that Kirwan wished to see me. He said that Kirwan wished to speak to me alone, and asked me to promise not to influence him in any way that would thwart the purpose of the Army. I made no promise, but he sent Kirwan down to see me. Kirwan told me that he had refused orders all the time he had been there, and that he would always reserve the right to refuse when he could not conscientiously obey. I agreed with him on this point absolutely. He told me he was being sent to a Base Hospital. I did not see Kirwan again.

The captain to whom I have already referred spoke to me again, and told me that he would see about getting me a hut or dug-out to myself. When I had last seen him I was in a hut alone, but at this time I was with a platoon. I told the captain that I would much rather stay where I was, for all the soldiers were friendly to me, and that I knew a good many of them before.

I heard one day that Mark Briggs had been badly knocked about. I went into the medical hut and saw him. The provost-sergeant told me that Briggs was not expected to live, and that if he did live he was to be shot. Briggs told me that he had been dragged on a rope along the "duck walk" for about a mile by four men, and then thrown into a shell hole. At the time when I saw him there first he was lying helpless on a bed, and the M.O. came in while I was there and attended to his injuries. I was about to leave, but he said I could remain, so I watched him dress Briggs's back, nearly the whole lower portion of which was torn raw. Briggs was very pale, and looked like an old man, but was not downhearted. When I came out of the hut I met the provost-sergeant, and he said: "Well, have you seen your friend?" I said that I had seen his own dirty work, and he replied: "That's the way you'll be to-morrow." He said what had happened to Briggs was Briggs's own fault, and that no man but a madman would endure it. Next morning the sergeant came to me and said: "Now, Baxter, to begin with, we are going to give you the father of all hidings before you leave this hut." I told him if those were his orders, and he deemed it his duty to carry them out, I would make no complaint. He then ordered the men who were with him to bring me along. I went with them, and the sergeant led the way to a place behind the front trenches, where he took me before an officer and explained the seriousness of my position. The sergeant said that he did

ARCHIBALD McC. L. BAXTER.

not wish me to be under any misapprehension as to what was going to happen. He said he was going to give me an order, and if I refused to obey it I would be instantly shot dead and that he himself would do the deed. I told them that I fully realised the position. The officer said that nothing I had to say now mattered, and reminded me that I was not in N.Z., but in France under shell fire. I was then given an order by the sergeant, which I refused to obey. The sergeant struck me on the mouth, and ordered me again, and I again refused. He then struck me under the jaw, making my mouth bleed, and when I refused again he said I was to get nothing but this treatment until I obeyed. He struck me again on the face and on the body several times. I told him that under the circumstances I would neither obey nor retaliate though he punched me to death. Some of the troops who were looking on called out to him to stop, and he then took me along to a pillbox and ordered me again, and when I again refused, he kept digging me in the ribs for a while and ordering me again and again. The work he was ordering me to do was to my mind equal to combatant service, and I told him I would rather be shot than do it. He then took me along till we met an officer, and he asked the officer if he could direct him to a place that was being heavily shelled. The officer pointed out an ammunition dump at some distance, and told him to take me along there for a while. The provost-sergeant took me to this place, which had been heavily shelled a few minutes before, and ordered me to stand there. When he was leaving me he said that he hoped that a shell would get me and blow me up to my Maker. The fire was very heavy for some time, and then slackened off, and I stayed where I was. When the sergeant came back he said I was a fool to stay there, and that I must have wanted to commit suicide. He said that he had done his part, and was not in love with the job, and that he did not want to have anything more to do with me, for he believed me mad. He then left me, saying that he would have to send in a report concerning me, and that in the meantime I should stay with the Otago boys. I did so, and did not see much of this sergeant again, for he left a few days later.

After this, Colonel Mitchell came to me and asked me how I was getting on. I told him that I was all right. He asked me if there was anything he could do for me, and I said that I did not know of anything. He asked if I had no request at all and no complaints, and I replied that I had none. He then said he was not going to allow me to be punished again, and would have to see the General about me. He told me he thought that I must have a mental twist, and I replied that he could think what he liked, but that I had nothing of the kind. He said that he would see Headquarters about me, and that if I had any request or complaint to make to communicate with him.

A few days after this we left the Ypres front and went back to Abele. I camped that night in a hut with Mark Briggs and several others. Briggs could hardly walk. It was a cold night, and when he

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

lay down on the floor I noticed that he had no blankets and offered him mine, but he refused to take it. The next morning the same officer who was there when Briggs was knocked about came into the hut and ordered me to go out to drill, and I told him that I did not go out on parade. He ordered me again, and I refused, and he then struck me in the face, knocking me down. I got up and he ordered me again, and when I refused again he kicked me and then struck me another blow and knocked me down. While I was down he kicked me several times about the body. I was knocked out, and he then ordered four men to carry me on to the parade ground. They picked me up and carried me out of the hut. When they got me out on the duck-walk the officer ordered them to lift me up high and let me fall on my back on the boards. He ordered them three times, but each time they let me down very gently. He then ordered them to proceed, and they carried me out on to the parade ground and set me on my feet, but I felt beat out, and lay down against my valise.

Colonel Mitchell passed along the ranks with some other officers and asked me what was the matter with me. I told him that I was right enough, and he passed on. I lay there for an hour or two, while the troops shifted to another camp not far distant. Four men came to me, and said that they had been sent to bring me down to this other camp, and that they had been told that if I would not walk they were to carry me. This camp was only about half a mile distant, and I walked with a man supporting me on each side. They gave me several spells on the way, and when they got there they took me into a hut and put some blankets over me and brought me a drink of hot tea.

I lay there until the afternoon, and the officer who had dealt with me in the morning came in and ordered me to go out on parade, but I made no answer. He asked me if I was going out and I said "No." He said that he would have me dragged out. He then left me, and in a while two men came and told me that they had been ordered to bring me out. They took me out and laid me down a few yards from the hut. From there I was taken before the Medical Officer, who asked me what was the matter. I told him that I had not paraded sick of my own accord but had been brought there, that I was bruised from head to foot, but had no complaint to make against anyone. He gave me some tablets, and I was taken back to the hut, and remained there that night.

Next morning we left that place and set out for the Somme by train. We were crammed into trucks in the usual way, and as I was not well I had a hard time. I do not remember the names of the places we were at out there. My health seemed to have given way, but I did not go on sick parade. No violence was used while at the Somme or after. I was taken to a dressing station one morning by two soldiers. I had to be carried at that time, and had not much life left in me. I was put on an ambulance waggon and sent off to

ARCHIBALD McC. L. BAXTER.

a hospital, where I was attended to, and a day or two after was sent to Boulogne, and received into hospital there. After the Medical Officer examined me he asked me if I had been under heavy shell fire, and I told him that I had on many occasions. He asked me how I came by certain marks of old bruises, and I told him some of my history. He asked me if I had been knocked down by a shell at any time, and I told him that I had, but that I had not been hurt. He then told me that he was glad I had told him all about myself, and that he did not blame me for my opinions. He told me that he would do anything he could for me, that I had been sent in there a sick man, and his business was to make me well.

I was very weak at this time, and about five weeks later, when I was sent to England, I had not picked up much, being still just over eight stone, about three stone below my ordinary weight.

This Medical Officer at Boulogne was one of the broadest-minded and most generous-hearted men that I have ever met, and he had a fine sense of humour. It was a good thing for me that I met him for at that time I was driven to the brink of an abyss. After I had been in hospital for a few days in England the M.O. came to me and asked me why I disobeyed orders in France, and I told him what the orders were, and he began to argue with me on the law of "the survival of the fittest." I told him that to my mind the fratricide and the suicide are much the same, and that the man who kills his fellows, believing that he is doing wrong, commits moral and intellectual suicide. He told me that I, through what I called passive resistance, and what he would call my stubbornness, had put myself in a position of absolute dependence on the Army. I replied that I was not ungrateful for what had been done for me, but that I thought the Army was responsible for me, for the military authorities knew what I was before ever they sent me out, but, if he did not want me there, all he had to do was to allow me to go out, and that I would look after myself and find my way back to New Zealand on my own. He talked to me no more, but sent me to bed for three days for what he was pleased to call my insolence.

There were a good few of the N.Z. boys there, and they were all good friends with me, and after a few months I was much better. We were visited by a N.Z. colonel one day, and he told several of us that we were being sent back to N.Z. He told me that he had heard about me, and was surprised to find me so well. He wished us a safe voyage home, and then left us. A few days after we were told that we were to embark at Southampton the following day. We crossed from that port to Le Havre, and travelled down through France by rail to Marseilles, and there embarked on the *Maraama*, after spending a few days at a place near the town. We went ashore at Colombo for a day and also at Albany, and then came on to Auckland, and next to Wellington.

When we came in at Wellington the M.O. called me and said that

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

I was to go before Colonel Allen and Mr. Myers. I went along with the M.O., and he showed me into a room where these two gentlemen were sitting, and the M.O. introduced me to them and went out. Mr. Myers asked me to sit down, and then asked me a few questions about my health. Sir James Allen asked me if I was still of the same mind with regard to military service, and I told him that I was. He then asked me if I had been badly treated while in the Army, and said that they had been charged with treating me and other Objectors very cruelly. I said that I had received treatment that I would call cruel. He asked me if I had any complaint to make to him, and I replied that I did not think that I should make a complaint while the men against whom I would have to make it were not here in New Zealand. He then asked me what I was doing while at the front, and I told him that I was given a document by the Commanding Officer, which stated that I was not under military control, and all that I had done in the Army was done by me voluntarily, out of a sense of fairness to the men I was with. He asked me whether I was a Conscientious Objector, and I answered that I was called one in the Army, but did not call myself by any name. He said: "Why did you object to military service?" and I replied, "Because I am against war." He then asked me did I know anything about No. 1 Field Punishment, and I replied, "Not much." He said that a letter that I had written from France had been published in the papers, and that I had stated in that letter that I had been subjected to this punishment, and asked if that was true. I told him that I did not know that the letter had been published, but that it was all quite true.

I think I have told pretty well all that passed at that interview except that Sir James asked me to describe No. 1 Field Punishment, and I stood against the cabin wall and showed how my arms were fastened and how my legs were tied at the knees and ankles. Sir James asked me, "What do you intend doing now?" and I said, "I don't know yet what is going to be done with me," and he said that there might possibly be an enquiry into these matters, and I said that if there was I would speak the truth.

Mr. Myers asked me concerning my condition when in hospital. I told him that I had been put in an observation ward for a day or two when I first went in, and that I asked the Medical Officer why he put me there, and he asked me if it troubled me, and I said that it did, and the Medical Officer then took me into another ward, where there were some New Zealanders.

This closed the interview, and I went back to my ward, and presently two friends came on board to see me. I was surprised to hear from them of a message which had been received by my people from Base Records, stating that I had been admitted to hospital in the United Kingdom, and that "my mental condition was causing anxiety." I cannot believe that any of the Medical Officers in the hospitals were responsible for such a statement, and certainly no New Zealand M.O.

ARCHIBALD McC. L. BAXTER.

could make such a statement, for I never met a N.Z. Medical Officer from the time when I was taken from the dressing station in France until I went aboard the hospital ship at Marseilles.

Shortly after I arrived at home a statement concerning me appeared in the Otago Daily Times, headed "Baxter Case.—The Conscientious Objector," and it was declared in this statement that I had set up my will in opposition to the will of the community. Now, I would like to say in this connection that with me it was not a matter of setting up my will against the public, but of doing what I believed to be right, and refusing to do what I believed to be wrong; and I do not believe that all that was done to me and to other Objectors was done by the will of the community.

All that I need to say in conclusion is that, although it was said that I appealed as a Religious Objector, as a matter of fact I did not appeal before a board on any ground at all, although I sent in a notice of appeal in which I stated that I would not act against my belief, and that by the help of God I would do no violence to any man. I was told in France that in my case it was not a question of services at all, but of submission. I did not see that it mattered whether I appealed or not, for I did not look for exemption. My real appeal was my conduct in the Army, and I have been discharged with a good character.

(Signed)

A. McC. L. BAXTER.

XVII.—GARTH C. BALLANTYNE.

My objections to military service were based mostly on humanitarian reasons and also on political grounds. I have been all my life, and still am, an absolute pacifist. My experiences, both in and out of the firing-line, have confirmed and strengthened my opinions, and I also take this opportunity of stating that under similar circumstances I would again act precisely as I did before.

I am writing this statement in answer to numerous requests, not only of my personal friends, but also of many soldiers who have heard of or seen a little of what I went through. Also I feel it my duty to make public a description of British military prisons in France, and to show people what even New Zealanders are capable of doing when backed by militarism.

It was at the Alexandra Barracks, Wellington, that I first experienced that cold shiver run down my spine as the cell door shut to and the bolts shot home. Never will I forget my feelings as I stood looking at the back of that door and analysing my thoughts. I could not help thinking of the animals in the Zoo, and my sympathy went out to those poor caged creatures as it had never done before.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

I had failed to go to camp when called up under the Conscription Act, and had determined, after thinking things over, that I would not run away, but would stay quietly at my home and face the matter out. A civilian policeman had found me there that morning and arrested me, and I was awaiting a military escort to take me to Trentham Camp in the evening. I spent that night in the guardroom, and was charged next morning, before Colonel Potter, with failing to report to camp on the 5th of March, 1917, as ordered.

On this, my first appearance at an orderly-room, I must admit to a little nervousness, but I managed to declare pretty emphatically that I had no intention of becoming a soldier. This, however, failed to convince the colonel, who merely reprimanded me and told me that if I "carried on" I should hear no more about my two weeks' overdue.

Previous to my arrest, I had been unable to ascertain whether there were any more like myself in camp at that time, so that my delight can well be imagined when, on being marched to the Q.M. Stores with a small party of other men, three more besides myself refused to accept the uniform. The officers at first affected the usual surprise with which they generally heard of our refusals to obey orders, but when they found that we were in earnest sent for the police, and had us all returned to the guardroom, where we lost no time in getting acquainted with one another.

Twenty-eight days' detention was the verdict next morning, and I found myself once more under arrest, returning to Alexandra Barracks.

The time passed fairly uneventfully with no particularly great hardship, although not being as yet used to imprisonment, I found the loss of liberty very trying. Here I made the acquaintance of some more comrades, including the Baxter Bros. and Little.

Again returned to Trentham, I went through the same performance at the Stores, and this time was remanded for a District Courtmartial, which took place about a week later. The attitude I adopted at the trial was to ignore the Court and to deny its right to try me. This was of no avail, and a week later I found myself, in company with three others, journeying to the Terrace Jail, with 84 days' hard labour ahead of me. On arrival there we went through the same performance as any ordinary criminals would have done, and shortly afterwards each of us was deriving great amusement out of the awkward figures the others cut in their ill-fitting prison clothing, my mates having an extra laugh at me because my broad arrows showed up very plainly.

Throughout the course of our sentences we were associated with and treated as ordinary criminals. When I first started to work in the Mt. Cook Prison I had on one side of me a man convicted of a hideous sexual offence and on the other a man who had twice been declared an habitual criminal. I found the conversation of the majority of the prisoners horrible to listen to. What attracted most of their attention was the Supreme Court sittings, and they discussed

the various crimes with brutal freedom. Whenever I talked with them myself I strove to draw them out to talk of themselves in order to hear their ideas of our present system of dealing with offenders against the law, and from what I heard there and from my own observations I came to the conclusion that our prisons were making ten hardened criminals to every one they cured. I hope that sweeping reforms will soon be brought about.

Of our treatment by the prison authorities I have no particular complaint to make. We were sent to them as criminals, and as criminals, no more and no less, we were treated. The fault lay with those who sent us there.

I was within a week of finishing my sentence, and was looking forward to getting back to Trentham, where I would be able to see my people in private and not in the presence of a warder, when one morning before breakfast the principal warder came to my cell and told me to pack up my kit, as I was "going away." I remembered afterwards that he had seemed to put peculiar expression into the words, although he professed ignorance as to the meaning of our shift, beyond the fact that I was to return to the Terrace Jail. On coming out into the yard with my belongings, I was surprised and pleased to find that the others had received similar instructions. On our arrival at the Terrace Jail the mystery was not solved, as the warders told us that they knew nothing, except that we were to be handed back to the military authorities. Accordingly, we bathed and shaved and our own clothes were returned to us, and we awaited developments. The military, however, preferred to do their work in the dark, and so we had to wait until evening for the escort to arrive. The escort refused us any information, and we set out, as I thought, towards Lambton Station. We did not, however, stop at the station, but passed it, heading for the wharves; and now, for the first time, I realised that there had been some foundation for the very vague rumours which had reached us to the effect that we were to be placed on a troopship.

On arrival at the wharves we proceeded to the side of the Waitemata, and were ordered to go aboard by the escort. This we refused to do. The escort then used force, and carried or hustled all my mates on board. The m.p., however, who was standing beside me evidently did not relish his job, for he asked me whether I was going on board, and I replied, "Not of my own free will." "Quite right," he answered, "and I am not going to put you there." I was thus left standing on the wharf for five minutes or so, during which time a fair crowd of watersiders, who happened to be changing shift at that time, had gathered around, and I spoke to them, telling them exactly what was happening, and asking them to spread the news. A voice replied that we had their sympathy to which I answered— as Mark Briggs had also answered—that something more than sympathy was required, and that it was up to the workers to see that no more were sent

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

away as we were being sent. Other m.p. were now returning from the ship, and on seeing me promptly grabbed me and carried me on board and down to join the others in the guardroom. A strong guard was left over us all night to ensure that we should not communicate with anyone on shore, and although my mother was living within half an hour's walk of the boat, and was also on the telephone, my requests to be allowed to communicate with her were refused.

Next morning our numbers were increased by others brought from the Barracks and from the Camp, and the fourteen C.O.'s now on board comprised the three Baxter Bros., Little, Briggs, Sanderson, Patton, Adin, Penwright, Harland, Gray, Kirwan, Maguire and myself. Whether it was accidental or not I don't know, but it was certainly curious that there were among us men from almost every province of New Zealand.

[To avoid repetition, I have omitted those portions of Mr. Ballantyne's account of the voyage from Wellington to Capetown, which are wholly in substantiation of Mr. Briggs's account. Mr. Ballantyne mentions that when they were ordered to have their hair cut short the C.O.'s refused, and were carried out one by one on to the hatchway by the guard, and there their hair was cut very short. "A sharp struggle ensued when Briggs attempted to resist the guard, and it took about six of them to hold him down whilst the barber cut his hair." Mr. Ballantyne also mentions that, while they were being forcibly stripped and re-dressed in uniform on the first occasion, a soldier with a sense of humour set a gramophone playing "Onward, Christian Soldiers." Mr. Ballantyne's narrative proceeds.—Ed.]

One day we were informed that the doctor had given instructions that we were to do physical drill. We replied that if we were supplied with skipping ropes, etc., we would take sufficient exercise to keep us in health. The corporal of the guard went away satisfied, but returned shortly afterwards and said that he had received instructions that he was to make us run round the deck and that he was to use the bayonet, if necessary, to carry this out. When we got on deck, however, we all sat down and refused to move, in spite of the guard, who stood around with fixed bayonets. The corporal, seeing that we were not to be bluffed, again went away, and this time returned with some skipping ropes and removed the guard.

[Mr. Ballantyne then describes the experiences of the C.O.'s at Capetown, and their treatment on the Norman Castle, after being transferred to that boat. His narrative is wholly in line with that of Mr. Briggs, and is therefore omitted.—Ed.]

On the last occasion on which we were forcibly dressed on the Norman Castle, before reaching Plymouth, the authorities thought to

GARTH C. BALLANTYNE.

make use of the fact that the ship was carrying a number of first-class passengers, including some ladies. Accordingly, we were divested of the shirt and singlet, dressed in just the trousers and tunic, and brought round from behind the wheelhouse, which had hitherto partly screened us, to the forward end of the poop-deck—into full view of the promenade deck, where some of the passengers were walking about. Men were placed to prevent us from returning, and we were released. Without any hesitation whatever we all stripped stark naked. We were soon returned to our former position, where we obtained towels, which we put around us as loin-cloths, remaining in that attitude until within a few days' sail of Plymouth, when we obtained a shirt and underpants each, and thus garbed we arrived.

During the latter end of the journey we were returned to the guardroom; and all through the danger zone we were under lock and key. The sentry on the door carried the key, which he took with him when he accompanied any of us on deck to the latrines or wash-house. If any accidents had occurred during his absence, owing to the rush of men up the stairs, he would have been unable to return to release us, and we should probably have been drowned like rats in a trap. On at least one occasion the key was lost, and some delay was experienced until the carpenter was brought and the door forced.

At the commencement of our journey, some of us had told the officers that as they had carried us aboard so they would carry us off again, and accordingly on arrival at Plymouth we proceeded to keep our promise. When the boat arrived in harbour, we were once again forcibly dressed in uniform and dragged up the stairs, along the deck and down the gangway on to the lighter, and when the lighter got alongside the wharf we were dragged down the gangway on to the wharf. Here eight of us were dumped on to a truck and wheeled a distance of one hundred yards or so to the train, which conveyed us to Sling Camp, on the Salisbury Plain. Here we were split up and sent to the guardrooms of the various camps, and I found myself in company with Briggs and Maguire in the guardroom of the Wellington Camp. A row between Briggs and a S.M. resulted in our getting no tea, and we went to bed. On getting up next morning we did not put on the uniform, but remained in our underclothing. Perceiving this the provost-sergeant fetched about 20 men, who forcibly dressed us, and placed us in separate cells, where we immediately stripped off the khaki again. As soon as this was noticed, we were again dressed, and this time we were handcuffed to prevent our removing the uniform. For over a fortnight we were thus dressed and handcuffed each morning and kept in solitary confinement. The authorities also tried to put us on bread and water, but each time this happened we refused to eat anything at all, and as they evidently did not wish to provoke us into hunger-striking we were generally supplied with fairly good food.

During this time we were constantly visited by officers and men

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

of every rank, who tried to coax, argue, or bully us into doing work of some kind, but we refused even to go out for a walk in uniform.

One very high official made himself particularly objectionable. What seemed to annoy him most was the fact that we refused to stand up or to say "sir" when addressing him. He entered my cell one evening after I was in bed, and asked me one or two questions. I answered him with a plain "Yes" or "No." "Why do you not say 'sir' when addressing me?" he asked. "Would you not say 'sir' when speaking to your employer?" I replied that I had no objection to saying "sir" to anyone whom I respected, but that as I had no respect for the rank he held and that what little I knew of him as a man had not led me to respect him, I did not feel called on to "sir" him.

As our last sentence of 28 days' confinement received on the boat had now run out, it was necessary that some definite charge should be laid against us in order that we might be kept in the guardroom. Accordingly, we were one day ordered by an n.c.o. in the presence of witnesses to go out on parade. This we refused to do, and we were charged with refusing to obey an order and were remanded by Colonel Saunders for courtmartial. A "summary of evidence" was taken, but as we were not allowed to speak without punctuating our remarks with "sirs," we preferred to say nothing.

The officers now began to get the idea that there was a ringleader among us, so one night we were separated. I was taken to the Canterbury guardroom. One of the sergeants of this camp was well hated by all the troops on account of the severity with which he treated all prisoners committed to his charge. As soon, however, as I got into the cell I removed the uniform. Later in the evening, wishing to go to bed, I knocked at the door and asked to be allowed to go to the latrine. The sergeant opened the door, but on seeing how I was dressed refused to let me out until I put on some more clothing. As I refused to do this, he closed the door again. Later I informed him that I suffered from piles, and that unless he allowed me out I would be likely to do myself an injury and that I should report the matter to the doctor in the morning. He then obtained assistance, forcibly dressed me, dragged me outside and then back again, knocking me about pretty considerably in the process. He then handcuffed my hands behind my back and kicked me into the cell, leaving me thus all night, so I was unable to make up my bed, and the weather being very cold, I suffered badly from cold and got no sleep that night.

Next morning bread and water only was brought to me, and I refused to eat it. Later in the day I informed an officer that as the authorities did not seem to be able to make up their minds what to do with us, and that as my health must inevitably break down very shortly under this treatment, I thought that I might bring matters to a head by refusing to eat anything until a more definite course was

GARTH C. BALLANTYNE.

determined upon. All that day and all the next I ate nothing, although tempting dishes were placed before me at each meal time.

The next evening I was again taken back to the Wellington Camp, where a draft for France was drawn up. An escort was in readiness, and I was marched away, handcuffed, to the train, which conveyed us to Folkestone. From there we crossed to Boulogne, and proceeded by motor lorry to the New Zealand Base at Etaples.

On the morning after my arrival there I was interviewed by Colonel Mitchell, the Camp Commandant. He used all manner of arguments to try and persuade me to do work of some kind, telling me that I should inevitably be shot if I persisted in my refusals when I was sent on up the line. He even went so far as to read to me lists out of General Routine Orders of men who had been shot, to show me that shooting was not an uncommon thing in the Army. I found out that two others, Little and Alec. Baxter, had preceded me at Etaples, and on my inquiring as to their whereabouts Colonel Mitchell informed me that they had been sent up to the front line, and that if they had not already been shot they were probably just waiting for the sentence to be carried out. I replied that in that case further argument was useless. If my friends were to be shot, then my place was at their side, and I asked to be sent to join them.

I remained in Etaples about a week, during which time, although I was kept in close confinement, I was not ill-treated in any way. At the end of that time I was escorted away with a draft to the reinforcement camp, which was then situated at Hazebrouck. Here on entering the guard tent, I was delighted to find Little and Alex. Baxter, looking in pretty good health. We had much to talk over, and they informed me that as yet nothing serious had happened to them except that force had been used to make them go out for a walk every day, with the equipment and rifle tied on to them, so that they could not throw them off. I was not, however, to enjoy their society for long, for early next morning I was shifted to another camp near by.

Here I got into trouble right away over my food. I had heard instructions given that I was to be treated the same as the ordinary prisoners, but when their food was brought the sergeant told me that he was "not going to fetch and carry for the likes of me," and that I would have to go on parade with the other men to get mine. I replied that I would parade for nothing, not even my food, so I went without any that day. On the next day he came and told me that he was going to take me to the cookhouse to get my dinner. Accordingly, he and another man grabbed hold of me and took me along, but I refused to carry the food back, whereupon he tied my hands together, and tied the tea ditty to them. I allowed him to do this quietly, but as soon as he let go I gave my hands a jerk and spilled the lot. At this he became enraged, and struck me in the face with his fist. I remained thus without food or even water for nearly five days, steadily refusing to go on parade to obtain it.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Each morning equipment was placed on my shoulders, and I was walked along the road between two men for about an hour or so. On the morning of the fifth day I had become so weak that I think I must have fainted, for I could afterwards remember very little of how I got home again. What would have been the end of this I don't know, but about this time the camp was broken up, and I again rejoined Little and Baxter, my food being brought to me along with theirs.

In the 'course of a conversation, the Adjutant of the camp told us that he could get no satisfactory instructions from the authorities as to how to deal with us, and that they were annoyed with the New Zealand Government for ever having sent us to France at all. In order, therefore, to force Headquarters to consider the matter he intended giving us an order, and if we refused to obey it he would remand us for a Courtmartial.

Accordingly a written order was given us, instructing us to parade at a certain time, fully equipped, to proceed to join up our units. Shortly before the time an n.c.o. warned us for the parade, and we informed him that we did not intend going on it, and the time passed without our making any attempt to do so. We were subsequently brought before the Adjutant and remanded for a Field General Court-martial on a charge of refusing to obey an order in a forward area. We were tried about a week later. Two of the officers on the Court-martial were of the Imperial Forces and not New Zealanders. I refused to take any part in the trial beyond handing in a written statement, detailing very briefly my previous experiences, a very short explanation of my position as a C.O., and also giving as my reason for refusing to take part in the trial the fact that I did not recognise the Court's right to try me as a soldier, seeing that I had not up till that time signed my name to a single document of any kind.

After the trial I was recalled twice by the President of the Court, who told me each time that he wished to give me another opportunity to reconsider my decision. He said that for the crime with which I was charged the Court could probably bring in one sentence only—that of death. I replied that I was fully aware of the position, and that the authorities had taken care that I had had plenty of solitary confinement in which to fully consider the matter, and that I was prepared to stand by my statement, whatever the penalty imposed by the Court. On being taken back to camp after the trial we were, strange to say, given complete liberty to wander about as we pleased, the chaplain even offering us money, which, of course, we refused. Whether the authorities wished to give us an opening to get right away or to go to one of the neighbouring villages and get drunk, and thus incriminate ourselves more definitely, I don't know, but none of us ever had any intention of running away, and we were all teetotallers, so that we were not likely to get into any difficulties in that way.

We had some time to wait for our sentences, and when the New Zealand camp moved away to another area we were shifted to the

reinforcement camp of the 44th Division of the Imperial Forces. We remained here some time, until one day our sentences were promulgated before a full battalion parade, and we found ourselves committed to five years' penal servitude. We were then escorted to St. Omer, to a receiving depot where prisoners were collected from the surrounding areas, and from where they were dispatched in gangs, handcuffed in pairs, and surrounded by armed guards, to the various military prisons.

Here I intend going beyond just my own personal experiences and giving a description of a British military hard labour prison in France, because I do not think that there will be published in New Zealand many other descriptions of these places written by men with such first-hand information as I was able to gather during my seven months' imprisonment in No. 10 Military Prison Camp, situated on the outskirts of Dunkirk.

This was a hard labour prison for men with sentences of over three months, and quite different from the field punishment compounds. Originally, most of the men in these prisons would be sentenced to five, ten, fifteen and twenty years' penal servitude, but these long sentences were given merely to frighten the rest of the troops before whom they would be promulgated. According to the law, men could not be kept abroad with sentences of more than two years' duration, so that as soon as the man arrived in prison his sentence was commuted to two years' hard labour. I would like to point out that, as will be seen from the number of this prison, there were nine other such places in France, No. 10 being the newest and also, I believe, the smallest, although it held about 400 men. Numbers of New Zealanders have served sentences in these prisons, although they are entirely under the control of the Imperial authorities, but there would probably be very few who would care to publish their names in connection with descriptions of them.

I would like to make it quite clear, however, that the majority of these prisoners were not criminals, but had merely been guilty of breaches of discipline or had been absent without leave for a short time. It must be remembered that offences which would hardly be considered crimes in civilian life, or which might be punished by a small fine, mean years of penal servitude in the Army. The Governor, whenever he was speaking to prisoners, was always careful to impress on them this fact--that they were not criminals and must not lose their self-respect, that they had merely been sent there to be taught discipline; but I do not think that there are any criminal prisons in which the men are more harshly treated, and it seems to me that to learn discipline means to lose all self-respect.

Many of the warders in these prisons had served in the pre-war military prisons of England and Scotland, and most of the rest were old soldiers, and were therefore not likely to have very sympathetic natures or troublesome consciences.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

As I have stated, after the promulgation of our sentences we were taken to a depot for prisoners at St. Omer. We were kept there several days, until about 30 men had arrived, and then very early in the morning we were paraded, handcuffed in pairs, and marched away, soldiers with fixed bayonets forming a guard right around us. We travelled by train to Dunkirk, and then formed up again, still handcuffed, and marched to the prison. As we drew near, what struck me first about the place was the unhealthiness of its situation. The ground was very low-lying and swampy, and there was absolutely no protection from the cold bleak winds and fogs of the Channel. The prison consisted of a few corrugated-iron huts and sheds and a number of bell-tents, the whole being surrounded by two high barbed-wire fences about six feet apart, with sentries at intervals walking between them. When we got inside the prison I noticed that the iron huts were the warders' quarters, the offices, cookhouse, stores, etc. All the prisoners were quartered in the tents, about sixteen or eighteen men in each. I also noticed two long low iron sheds, with small windows high up the walls, which I was very soon to find out contained the punishment cells.

The idea of the warders seemed to be to "cow down" every new prisoner from the start, and so, for the first hour or so, we were rushed about, yelled at, bullied, and had all manner of threats and warnings hurled at us if we did not jump about and look alive. We were searched and then taken to have a bath. The prison was at this time not properly completed, and so the thirty of us were given two small tubfuls of lukewarm water to wash in. As this was in the beginning of December, the weather was pretty cold, and we had all been wearing heavy woollen underclothing; but we were told that as there was no more underclothing in the prison to replace our own when dirty the sooner we got used to being without underclothing the better, and so our underpants and undershirts were taken away from us.

We three C.O.'s were in trouble as soon as we got into the office, for we refused to sign the books. A warder then took us on one side and asked us whether we were going to work. We replied that we did not intend to, and we were taken away and locked up in the cells. Next morning we were brought out and definitely ordered to work, but we refused, and were returned to the cells. The Governor sentenced us to what was known in the prison as "three threes," which meant three days' solitary confinement, three days' bread and water, and three days' No. 1 Field Punishment, the sentences running concurrently. We were placed in separate cells.

At 7 o'clock in the morning we were given 8oz. of dry bread and a drink of water. At 8 o'clock our hands were handcuffed behind our backs with figure-eight handcuffs. Now, ordinary handcuffs have two links and a swivel between them, thus allowing a fair amount of freedom of movement. In figure-eight handcuffs, however, the two

loops are solid in one piece, so that with these on behind our backs our whole wrists, arms and shoulders were rendered almost immovable. Field Punishment No. 1 means having these on for 12 hours in the day. We were given nothing further to eat until 5 o'clock in the evening—ten hours since our last meal—when another 8oz. of dry bread and some water were brought us, and in order that we might eat it our hands were moved from behind to in front of us, to be returned, however, behind us as soon as we had finished eating and left there until 8 o'clock in the evening.

The cells in which we were confined were very small, barely seven feet square by eight feet high; the walls and roof were corrugated iron and the floor concrete. Outside the ground was covered with snow, and inside the iron walls and ceiling were dripping with frost. During the first morning I sat down on the floor to rest my legs, but I rapidly became so cold and stiff that without the help of my hands I had the greatest difficulty in getting on my feet again. This was a lesson to me, and during the remainder of my punishment I walked from corner to corner of my cell, three short strides each way, for the full 12 hours each day. My arms and shoulders ached almost intolerably, and became so numbed with cold that when the handcuffs were removed they hung powerless at my sides. For weeks and weeks afterwards I felt the effects of this punishment in my arms.

This much was the authorised punishment, but during the time that a prisoner was in the cells he was in the hands of the warder in charge, who administered by kicks and blows such punishments as he deemed necessary for the "maintenance of good order and discipline in the cells." Generally, when a prisoner was sent to the cells for punishment he was first taken into a cell, stripped naked, and sometimes handcuffed; then the warder would proceed to administer a sound thrashing, using both his hands and feet, one warder during his turn in charge of the cells going so far as to use a heavy leather belt. Then, when the prisoner was beginning to get groggy, buckets of freezing cold water would be thrown over him to revive him, and finally he would be given a bucket and cloth and be told to dry up his cell before he would be given back his clothes. Often the bumps and thuds of the poor prisoner against the iron walls and his yells and cries for mercy could be heard all over the compound.

The next form of punishment we experienced was shot drill. This is an old form of punishment, abolished years ago in the navy as being inhuman. It is still good enough, however, for our up-to-date military prisons. The shot in this case consisted of a round bag of about 9 inches in diameter, filled with sand, and supposed to weigh 28lb., although when the sand became wet it was usually heavier. To do the drill the prisoner stands with the shot between his feet. The warder stands with a whistle, and in time to his blasts the prisoner first bends down, picks up the shot, and balances it on the palms of his hands in front of himself; then, on the next whistle he takes three

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

quick steps forward, on the following whistle placing it down between his feet again and standing up straight; then down, up, three paces forward, down; and so on for perhaps an hour, with only one or two short rests of a few minutes. Each movement has to be made distinctly and sharply, and the warder's whistle is generally just a bit ahead each time, so that the prisoner has to go his hardest in order to keep up. It is, in fact, just an ingenious device to tax absolutely the man's strength to the utmost. The effect I found was to make me horribly giddy and to produce terrible pains in my back and forearms. This punishment was often given in conjunction with No. 1 Field Punishment.

The prisoner sentenced to No. 1 Field Punishment was stood with his back to a post, and his hands handcuffed behind the post, and he was held practically immovable by three straps, one around his chest, another around his knees, and the other around his ankles. I have seen men kept thus in driving snow and sleet for two hours, and when released they could scarcely stand. They would then almost immediately be put on to shot drill "to loosen their joints."

About this time Little, Baxter and myself managed to have a bit of a consultation, and as a result we decided that we would work, seeing that the majority of the work done by the prisoners consisted in the construction of protections against air raids. On our making our decision known, we were sent out to live in the tents, the authorities, however, taking the precaution to put us each into separate section of the prison, so that from this onwards we saw very little of each other.

I had now a better opportunity of observing the general conditions of the prison. Rather naturally I suppose, one of the first things that claimed my attention was the food supply. The rations I found were as follows:—Breakfast: 1 pint of pretty thin gruel without milk or sugar and very often without even salt, 8oz. bread, 2oz. dripping, and 2oz. cheese. Lunch: 8oz. bread and 4oz. bully-beef. Tea: 8oz. bread and 1 pint of soup, in which (if one was lucky) there might be a piece of fat meat or a potato. This, I found to be very poor fare for men working long hours at hard manual labour in a bitterly cold climate. In fact, the men became so ravenously hungry that it was no uncommon thing, when they happened to be working at the R.N.A.E. aerodrome or any of the other camps around the prison, and could get near the cookhouse, to see them sneaking over to the swill tub and diving into it for pieces of stale bread or a bone with meat on it, and then literally pushing it down their throats so as to get it eaten before the warder might catch sight of them. What troubled me most was the lack of a hot drink of any sort. All we were given to drink was cold water, and as this was contained in a bucket placed out in the open it often became frozen, and it was necessary to break the ice on top to get a drink.

The daily routine of the prison was as follows:—Reveille at 5.30

GARTH C. BALLANTYNE.

a.m. At a quarter to 6 the gates of the various sections of the prisons were opened and the men marched out with their towels to wash. Now, the wash-house would accommodate only about 40 or 50 men at a time, so that it was necessary to go through in sections, and it would take about half an hour for the 400 odd men to go through. On this parade we were not allowed to wear coats, and, as I mentioned before, we had no underclothing, so that we had to go out in just a shirt and trousers, very often with the snow lying thick on the ground and a cold bleak wind blowing in from the Channel, and at that time of the year it would be still quite dark. The time during which we were waiting to go in to wash would be occupied with perhaps a little physical training or we would be made to double round and round the square. The first ones to wash would not be allowed to return to their tents until all had finished. In the wash-house the water in the taps was very often frozen, so that the basins were filled the day before. In the morning, to use the water, the ice on the top would have to be broken, and as the water could not be renewed five or six men would have to wash in each basin of water. When all had finished the men would return to their tents, being handed breakfast as they went in. After breakfast every man had to shave every day. As it was against the rules for any man to have any edged tools in his possession, we could not each keep our own razors. About six razors and brushes were placed in each tent every morning and collected up again after they were finished with. The razors were supposed to be kept in order by the barber, as we had no strops on which to sharpen them ourselves, but as the razors were only very poor issue ones to start with, and as there were about 300 to do, the state they were in can well be imagined. Shaving with such razors, water that was near freezing, ordinary common yellow soap and no glass was indeed a ticklish operation. Just before I came out an attempt was being made to give each man his own razor, but it was not succeeding too well. After breakfast, we were paraded on the square and inspected by the Governor. (I have seen men sent off this parade because they were not looking too clean—and it is hardly surprising under the circumstances that such cases were sometimes found—and afterwards stripped and scrubbed with an ordinary floor scrubbing-brush in cold water until the blood was running from them.) After that we were told off into working parties and marched away to our work, which, as I have explained, consisted for the greater part in the building of dug-outs and protections against air raids. In the winter we stopped work in time to be back in the prison just before dark, and as the days grew longer we worked later, until we could work until 6.30, which was the usual knock-off time during the summer.

It was not customary to stop work for bad weather. All through the winter we worked, hail, rain or snow; and often when we got back to prison our boots, socks and clothing would be wet through. We

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

had no chance of drying them or of obtaining fresh ones, so it was just a case of turn into bed to keep warm. I found that I had to place my socks between the blankets under me to keep them from freezing stiff during the night.

We worked seven days a week, no distinction being made for Sunday; in fact, no distinction was made for Christmas or New Year. We worked all Christmas Day in a blinding snowstorm, and had, if anything, rather worse food than usual. I do not think that many of the prisoners will ever forget Christmas, 1917-18.

If you had gone to the majority of these prisoners and asked what they most desired, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred you would have got the answer: "A good feed and then some cigarettes." Nearly every soldier is an inveterate smoker, and short of actual physical torture the greatest hardship that can be put on him, especially under trying circumstances, is to cut off his supply of smokes. So great did the craving for tobacco become with some of the prisoners that I have seen them picking up dirty cigarette butts off the road and chewing them, and it was a very common practice to gather up the butts, unravel them, and remake them in pieces of newspaper or anything else that was handy. A certain amount of tobacco was smuggled into the prison, in spite of the fact that every man was searched every night and that the discovery of even a trace would mean days of solitary confinement, etc.

The general health of the men in the prison was certainly bad. Practically all looked emaciated and were suffering from chronic diarrhoea as a result, I think, of drinking too much ice water. It was no use parading sick for this complaint, as the general cure was to put the patient into solitary confinement and starve him until he was better. Boils were also common. Soon after I went into the prison my hands became badly chapped, my left hand swelled up and then cracked, forming running sores which I did not get healed for over two months. Every night I had to go on sick parade to get it dressed, and this meant, perhaps, standing for anything up to an hour in the snow outside the medical hut waiting my turn to go in. How this treatment did not kill some of the men who were there through illness used to be a constant source of wonder to me. Although both my hands were wrapped up in bandages, I was not during a single hour excused duty, but had to carry on my work just the same. I was not even allowed warm water to wash in, although the placing of my hands whilst in this condition in very cold water caused me extreme pain. Later on, one of my heels got frostbitten also, and I was unable to put on a boot for over a fortnight. During this time I was put to work in the tailors' shop darning socks. Probably neither my hands nor my heel would have got better until the weather had got warmer had not my health completely broken down about the end of March, and I was sent away to hospital for two weeks.

Skin diseases of various sorts were also very common, especially

what is known as impetigo. Twice during my imprisonment my face was covered with the mattery sores of this complaint, which was doubtless spread about by the razors and shaving brushes.

It was seldom that a man could get any satisfaction by going on sick parade if he was not feeling well, for to be marked light duty meant to be worked harder than usual. The commonest occupation for sick men marked "light duty" was wheeling barrows full of sand into the prison to make paths and form the parade ground.

The bathing accommodation would have been fairly satisfactory had sufficient time been allowed to use it properly, but usually the warder in charge would be in a hurry to get finished with his job, and he would rush the men through without giving time to have a decent wash. The supposedly clean clothing issued to us was generally in a shocking state. There was no reason why in a place like that proper fumigation should not be carried out and lice practically eliminated, but the clothes were in such a bad state that almost every man was crawling alive.

Of recreation for the prisoners there was absolutely none. No books or papers of any sort were allowed. Sundays were passed the same as every other day in work; there was no chance of a rest. A chaplain used to come every second Thursday, and in order that his coming should not interrupt work the service was held at 7 o'clock in the morning. I think most of the prisoners looked forward to the service, as it was a change from the deadly monotony of the prison routine, and a good many enjoyed "having a sing" in the hymns. It was a very noticeable fact, however, that although a fair volume of sound was produced in the hymns, "God save the King" was usually a duet for the chaplain and the regimental sergeant-major.

The prisoners were allowed to receive all letters that came for them, but were only allowed to write once a month, and then under such heavy censorship that beyond a remark or two on the state of the writer's health nothing further could be said, and even that was liable to censorship if the report was not good. It is a remarkable fact, however, that although my mother wrote every mail to me, I did not receive any word from New Zealand at all for nearly twelve months—until after I had consented to come out of prison and do medical work, and then the whole lot (over twenty in number) were given me at once. There were also some letters of mine to my mother which never arrived.

It was hardly to be wondered at that, under the circumstances, the men in the prisons became very irritable and bad-tempered. In fact, every bad trait in their character was here given an opportunity to develop, for the whole conditions encouraged meanness and deceitfulness, encouraged the men to shirk on their mates, and so to distrust and become suspicious of each other. Many were the quarrels I saw over the cutting up of rations, for each man suspected that his mates would do him out of his fair share if they got half the

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

chance; and so woe betide anyone who cut up the bread before everyone was there to see it done, and then each man took his turn to cut it up, and, by mutual consent, he always took the last, and, consequently, the smallest piece left, so that he would be sure to divide it evenly. It was quite an exception to find a man who had sufficient will power and control of himself to maintain his equanimity, and I frankly admit that towards the end, in spite of the fact that I was fully aware of the danger, I was always losing my self-control.

It is inevitable that wherever large bodies of men are gathered together there will always be found a certain number who are below the average in intelligence—just a bit “dopey,” as they are usually called in the Army, and I think it is an extremely regrettable thing that many such men were placed in the Army, where individuality is not taken into account, and so they get into trouble often through no other reason than their lack of intelligence to understand their position. Many of these men found their way into such places as Dunkirk Prison, and then it was a case of “God have mercy on them,” for the warders and other prisoners would not. Weaklings, who with careful and proper tuition, become fairly useful citizens in some cases, became battered derelicts verging on lunacy.

I shall never forget the case of one young chap, scarcely more than a boy he looked. His life had been made so hard for him in the Army, that, thinking to escape, he had one day placed his hand on the rail in front of the wheel of a slowly-moving truck, and had allowed it to remain there until the wheel passed over it, badly crushing the wrist. Unluckily for him, the doctors had fixed it up fairly well, although it still was very mis-shapen, and then he had been sent to prison as punishment for a self-inflicted wound. There he was the butt of every warder and the joke of almost every prisoner. What little intelligence he had was slowly but surely driven out of him. I had befriended him a little, and he used to come to me with such questions as to what would happen to him if he were to eat sand, would it kill him or only make him ill? and really I sometimes had hardly the heart to dissuade him from such a means of ending his misery. His was by no means an isolated case.

In spite of the severity of the punishment for the offence, attempts to escape were fairly common. During the time I was there some fifty odd prisoners made bids for their freedom. Nearly all got clear away from the prison, but I can only remember three cases in which they were not caught after a short time. Escapees, on being returned to the prison, were immediately leg-ironed. The irons were rivetted on each leg, and the connecting chain, which was about three feet long, was looped up to the belt, so that the man could walk, but with a slightly-restricted stride. The usual punishment consisted of fourteen days' solitary confinement, during which the prisoner would be handcuffed with figure-eight handcuffs, and would be on bread and water diet three days out of five. Then there would be twenty-eight

GARTH C. BALLANTYNE.

days of No. 1 Field Punishment and shot drill on what was called No. 2 diet, which consisted of porridge and dry bread for breakfast, dry bread for lunch, and porridge and potatoes for tea. Then would follow a further twenty-eight days still on No. 2 diet, during which the prisoner would still wear the leg irons, and would be put to work around the prison. As the irons were rivetted on they could not be removed at nights, and specially-made clothes with buttons the full length of the outside of the legs had to be worn to enable the man to undress.

It must not be thought either that by going to prison soldiers would escape entirely the dangers of war, for Dunkirk was the most air-raided town of either France or Britain. Just before I went there the Germans had dropped leaflets warning all the inhabitants to evacuate it, as they intended levelling it to the ground, and for several months afterwards every fine night there would be aeroplanes overhead bombing, and although they did not succeed in fully carrying out their intentions, there was scarcely a street in the town which did not show the effects of the bombs, and an aerodrome not half a mile from the prison was twice destroyed.

Over a fairly lengthy period also the town was continually shelled by long-range guns from the land, and was twice bombarded from the sea. Although the prisoners constructed huge and practically bomb-proof dug-outs at various camps round about, those for their own use were of the most meagre description and would scarcely have stopped an anti-aircraft "dudd," let alone a bomb.

To return to myself and my two companions. In one or two talks which we had managed to get together, we had summed up the position as follows: We had successfully defied the military authorities. They had threatened to shoot us if they could not make soldiers of us. We had deliberately placed ourselves in such a position by the disobedience of orders that had we been ordinary soldiers we would certainly have been shot, and the authorities had merely sent us to prison, thus proving that their threats had been bluff and that they dared not shoot us. We had also heard through different New Zealand soldiers that owing to the stand made by the fourteen deported men and the outcry which their deportation had caused, the Government had decided not to send any more men out of the country against their will, so that we now came to the conclusion the matter was purely a personal one as to what our future movements should be.

I gave the matter very long and careful consideration. On the one hand, we had become fairly accustomed to the prison, and with the approaching summer weather a great deal of the hardship would disappear, so that provided my health had stood the strain, and that was doubtful seeing that although I am just on six foot tall, when I weighed myself shortly after my release I was only 9st. 12lb. fully clothed, I could have stayed on there until the end of the war. On the other hand, I had heard a great deal about the war from the

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

soldiers, but I felt that, in my anti-militarist work in the future, if I was able to gain the knowledge first hand, how much stronger I would be able to make my testimony. I also felt that by going into the front line and by there carrying out my work at least as well as the average soldier, I would silence that taunt which was so often being thrown at me, that I had refused military service because I was afraid. So that, much as I disliked placing myself under the control of the military authorities, when a letter came, to me from Colonel Mitchell offering to obtain my release on condition that I undertook medical work, I replied that I was ready to do so, provided that I was not asked to take the oath. My companions had also decided on a similar course, and, following on a visit to the prison by Colonel Mitchell, we were released on June 18, 1918. Two days after release Baxter reported sick, and was sent to England with rheumatic fever, contracted by exposure and hardship in the prison. After a short course of instruction in medical work at the base camp, Little and I were sent up the line as regimental stretcher-bearers. Unfortunately, Little was wounded on our second day in the line, and died at the casualty clearing station. I remained at this work until the Armistice was signed, and then went to Germany with the army of occupation doing medical work in the regimental aid post.

(Signed) GARTH C. BALLANTYNE.

XVIII.—PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE.

The wholesale jailing of Conscientious Objectors proceeded apace, both before and after the deportations, until at last between 300 and 400 New Zealand men—many of them with wives and very young children depending upon them—were held under lock and key. It is safe to say that far more men were required to look after the C.O.'s than the imprisoned men numbered. So that the imprisoning of the C.O.'s was not only wrong from a moral viewpoint, but essentially stupid from a military viewpoint.

To the following sentences must be added, in a great many cases, additional sentences of 28 days in the detention barracks. Some of the men served two such sentences before reaching the civil prison; and the list herewith is only of sentences served in civil prisons. Thus the sentences inflicted on the New Zealand C.O.'s for refusing military service ranged from one to four, a large number of the victims serving three sentences. This list is by no means a complete record of the men whose possession of a conscience won for them a prison experience. It does not include the Maori Objectors, whose names I have not been able to obtain; nor yet does it

PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE.

include all the Europeans. Still, it is formidable enough to furnish a warning for all New Zealanders as to the menace of an intensified and intolerant militarism:—

EIGHTY-FOUR DAYS AND DEPORTED.—Socialist Objectors: F. Adin, W. Little, Mark Briggs, H. Patton. Religious Objectors: Garth C. Ballantyne (also Socialist), A. E. Sanderson, L. Penwright, T. P. Harland, D. R. Gray. Pacifist Objectors: A. McC. L. Baxter, Alex. Baxter, J. Baxter. Irish Objectors: D. Maguire, L. J. Kirwan.

EIGHTY-FOUR DAYS.—W. Staff.

SIX MONTHS.—Egerton Gill (Religious).

NINE MONTHS.—G. A. Jennings, J. Gribble.

TEN MONTHS.—J. M. Hankers, W. J. Wild.

ELEVEN MONTHS.—Hugh Baxter (Pacifist), H. Bland (Religious), P. Cody (Irish), P. Dixon (Religious), J. T. Hogan (Religious), R. Hopkins, C. Goodson (Socialist), H. R. Urquhart (Religious), F. Guná (Socialist), F. Lamb (Religious and Socialist), R. P. Knapé (Socialist), T. Kells (Religious), H. Smith (Religious), Wall, Walsh, F. Rogerson (Socialist). Mr. Urquhart also served a sentence of one year under the War Regulations (Sedition) Act.

ONE YEAR.—C. E. Warden (Religious and Socialist), Arthur Borrowes (Socialist), W. Hall, W. H. Jones (Socialist), A. Gunn (Socialist), P. Gunn (Socialist), Noel Goldsbury (Religious), Roy Brady (Socialist), G. Wears Samms (Socialist), James H. Roberts (Socialist), Prendergast, Richard Goode.

ONE YEAR AND ELEVEN MONTHS.—P. R. Clayton (Religious), F. G. Herbert, A. Parsons, W. Maddern, D. H. Day, J. Stubberfields, James Walker (Religious), S. E. Salter (Religious), A. J. Oston (Socialist), S. R. Doming, F. Sumner.

TWO YEARS.—Socialist Objectors: H. Bryant, Norman Bell (Christian), Frank Robinson, D. T. Sullivan, G. E. Quartermain, Frank Carroll, Charles Fox, W. E. Robinson, F. J. Gavin, J. S. McDonald, D. Gunn, Robt. J. Gould, G. Carian, A. Bradley, W. G. Gray, E. R. Williams, W. Yeomans, Henry Moffatt, H. Wilson, J. Saunders, R. Tarbutt, J. F. Patterson, A. Sherrock, H. Campbell, Wm. Worrall, P. C. Webb, M.P., T. Logan, Alex. May, J. K. Worrall, L. J. Woods, C. Robertson, Howard Hopkins, Barroclough, A. Fraser, A. Hardinge, W. White, J. Calpin, A. Fraser, H. R. Gray, W. H. Haydon, M. Kelson, F. A. Macrae, Jeffreys. Religious Objectors: R. Arthur, I. S. Aichen, B. A. Allerly (also Socialist), A. J. Aitken, J. A. Brailsford, T. A. Bentley, H. Blundell (also Socialist), F. Pallesen, L. Robinson, A. Blanchard, J. B. Goulding, A. Beaton, W. B. Donovan, W. S. Badger, S. Woods, J. W. Duke, Robin Page, R. J. Halkett, R. A. Stone, J. R. Olley, Jasper O'Brien, P. C. Patton, A. Page, Pettybridge, S. A. Palmer, H. Rankin, S. Strong, R. A. J. Palmer, R. J. Irvine, W. J. Young, J. McCormack, C. H. McCormack, J. Rogers, T. B. Struthers, H. J. Levett, A. C. McIntyre, H. Wright, A. H. Varnham, George E. Billings, J. S. Billings, J. W. Clapham, Ed. H. Dowsett, D. M. Banks (also

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Socialist), L. Batten, H. G. Blanchard, Doherty, Ferguson, D. G. Furlong, W. R. C. Greenhill, J. Gray, R. Gray, T. H. Ireton, J. G. Holtham, A. E. Johns, McFarlane, A. O. Isaacson, Percy Gill. Irish Objectors: T. Brosnan, M. O'Connor, J. O'Brien (also Socialist), D. Mangan, W. Malley, G. H. Lloyd, Metcalfe, G. T. Drum, Daniel Brosnan, J. J. Lloyd, Jordan, D. F. Murphy, T. M. Driscoll (also Socialist). Pacifist Objectors: S. Fountain, F. F. Fowler, L. Foley. Other Objectors: J. S. Morris, Daglish, Reed, Doody, Hodgkins, Ash, Pottinger, Gunter, Murraine, Hannan, Christian, Sheehan, Schultz, Appleby, Cole, A. J. Morris, Collins, Ryan, Shirer, Dickson, Anderson, Ross, Conway, Higgins, Hill, Lynch, McLean, Wickes, Stapleton, Skinner, Clark, Holroyd, Cunningham, Cook.

TWO SENTENCES (in civil prison).—Donald Baxter (Pacifist), 11 months, 2 years; K. H. Broughton (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; H. R. Blade (Religious), 11 months, 6 months; J. H. Bennett (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; A. R. Patten (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; P. Dodge (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; J. J. Hussey (Socialist), 84 days, 2 years; Davidson (Socialist), 11 months, 2 years; H. Adin (Socialist), 11 months, 2 years; D. A. Jones (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; H. King (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; H. C. Kelbey (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; F. Money (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; J. McKenzie (Socialist), 11 months, 2 years; R. A. Macrae (Socialist), 11 months, 2 years; D. M. N. McCormick (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; W. T. Virtue (Socialist), 11 months, 2 years; S. C. Watchorn (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; C. A. Watson (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; P. G. Wright (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; W. R. Robertson (Socialist), 11 months, 2 years; C. W. Read (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; S. B. Read (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; R. Slockdill (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; C. C. Steele (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; J. Pickering (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; Jones (Socialist), 11 months, 2 years; R. H. Phillips (Religious), 11 months, 2 years; J. Moye (Socialist), 11 months, 2 years; John Roberts (Socialist), 1 year, 6 months; A. K. Henderson (Pacifist), 9 months, 2 years; Tom Kelly (Irish and Socialist), 4 months, 2 years; L. Cody (Irish), 11 months, 2 years.

THREE SENTENCES (in civil prison).—D. Williams (Irish and Socialist), 84 days, 11 months, 2 years; J. Cody (Irish), 84 days, 11 months, 2 years; Rhys Morrish (Religious Objector), 84 days, 11 months, 2 years.

OTHERS (sentences not ascertained).—Armstrong, J. Brindle, Church, Craig, Gear, F. T. Johnstone, Scott, Morris, Selby, Newman, Mills, Spaulding, Bowline, Blackburn, H. Goldsbury, Holtham, Hasse, Hawker, McManus, McKee, Hedley, H. Ellman, Drummond, Deane, Granger, Brady, Bolton, Joyce, Jessop, Kells, Kelly, Marshall, Pearson, Plewes, Gankhurst, Thackeray, Vallance.

XLX.—DIFFERENTIATED SENTENCES.

The contrast in the sentences awarded the Conscientious Objectors is most marked. For practically the same "offence" men received sentences which ranged from seven days' detention in the barracks to two years' hard labour in the common jail.

This differentiation is conspicuous even in the cases of members of the same family. The sentences inflicted on the Baxter brothers furnish an illustration. The weight of the military law fell on this family with unabated relentlessness. There were seven sons in the family, one of whom is married and has four children, and, therefore, did not come within the scope of the Military Service Act during the war period. The six other sons, who are Passive Objectors, were all seized by the military authorities. Three of them were three times sentenced in New Zealand (28 days' detention, 84 days' civil prison, 28 days' detention) and then deported; the other three were jailed. The brothers were practical farmers, but the military left the aged parents without a son to work the little farm. The father is an old man, crippled with rheumatism; the mother is nearly seventy years of age. After the first three had been forcibly transported, two of the remaining three (Donald and Hugh) were called in the same ballot, arrested on the same day, tried by courtmartial on the same charge, and sentenced on the same day each to 11 months' hard labour. Hugh was sent to Waimarino, Donald to Templeton Prison. When Hugh had served his 11 months he was released and returned to his home, but Donald was ordered into camp, and, on again refusing, was sentenced to two years' hard labour. Another brother, William, was arrested a few months later, was sentenced to 11 months' hard labour, which sentence he served, and was then released. So that Donald was penalised to the extent of nearly three years' imprisonment with hard labour, whilst his two brothers, for the same offence, were only required to serve 11 months. Hugh, after his release, died of influenza. Through someone's carelessness, the military law pursued him past the grave; and in due time his name appeared in the "Gazette" as a defaulter who was to be deprived of all civil rights for ten years. Donald is still in prison, but William is free.

The Codys are another family doomed to be broken up and threatened with ruin by the Military Service Act. They are also a family of farmers, and are Irish Objectors. There are five sons, all of whom were called up under Section 35 of the Act, with the result that three were ordered into camp. They refused to obey the order, and the two other brothers were thereupon seized by the military and sent to prison upon refusing to undertake military service. The aged father was left to work a large and heavily-mortgaged holding without the assistance of any of his sons. P. Cody served a sentence

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

of 11 months, and has not since been re-sentenced. Jack Cody, who was first arrested in July of 1917, is at present serving his fourth sentence (including that in the detention barracks). Lawrence Cody served a sentence of 11 months, and was then given an additional two years' hard labour, which he is now serving. Michael Cody was arrested on August 3, 1918; served a sentence of three months at Mount Cook; was held 56 days awaiting courtmartial; and is now serving two years' hard labour, which sentence will not be completed until the end of July, 1920.

Another case in point is that of the three Wright brothers (Religious Objectors), of Auckland. One served 11 months, and was released; another served 11 months, and was then sentenced to two years' hard labour. The third, a Second Division man, was ordered into camp, but peace being proclaimed, he was not required, and so escaped either military service or prison.

David Williams (Irish Objector) served 84 days in the civil prison, was then ordered into camp, and on again refusing service, was sentenced to 11 months. On the completion of this sentence he was again ordered to take the uniform, and on refusing the third time was sentenced to two years. He is still in prison.

Rhys Morrish (Unitarian) served 84 days, after which he was sentenced to 11 months, and was then given a third sentence of two years' hard labour, which he is still serving.

C. A. Watson, teacher, was sentenced to 11 months' imprisonment without hard labour, on account of being classed C1 and considered unfit; and, after serving this sentence, was re-sentenced to two years—with hard labour.

Kenneway Henderson, artist, Tolstoyan, and anti-militarist for more than 14 years, was "reluctantly" sentenced by courtmartial to nine months' hard labour. When this sentence was completed, he was allowed to go free for six weeks while peace negotiations were proceeding; and was then re-arrested and sentenced to two years' hard labour.

A letter from a C.O. in Waikeria (1/12/18) says: "Our sentences have been varied. There are some C.O.'s doing their third term, and some their first. Some are doing two years, others 11 months. Two of the 11 months' men go out the second week in January next, and others who came here about the same time don't go out until January, 1920—and all are in for the same offence."

Yet another anomaly arises out of the ending of the war. Those Conscientious Objectors whose sentences expired after the Armistice was signed were not re-arrested, while others* whose sentences expired just a short time before that date were re-sentenced—generally to two years' hard labour. In this connection, it has previously been pointed out that "the matter of time (which is out of every man's control) and not the nature of the offence became the deciding factor as to whether a man was to enjoy freedom or be locked in prison walls."

XX.—P. C. WEBB, M.P.

Mr. P. C. Webb, M.P. for Grey, took a most prominent part in fighting Conscription both on the public platform and during the passage of the Bill through Parliament. Along with other members of the Labour Party and some non-Labour members, he was responsible for beating the proposal, backed strongly by Sir Joseph Ward, that the soldiers' pay should be restricted to 25/- a week, with sixpence per day allowance for each child. The Labour members and those who thought with them were able to add 10/- per week to the soldiers' wage, and 1/- per day to the child's allowance. When he was drawn in the ballot, Mr. Webb made it clear that he would not go into camp unless his constituents desired him to do so. His letter to Sir James Allen, printed below, fully explains the position he took up. During February of 1918, he was engaged in vigorously supporting my candidature for Wellington North, and took part in the great public meeting held immediately after the contest. After being drawn in the ballot he tendered his resignation as M.P. for Grey to give the Government an opportunity to test the will of the electorate; but the Government was so well satisfied that the constituency was against its member being conscripted that it made discretion the better part of valour and refused to accept the challenge. Mr. Webb was returned unopposed. His appeal was duly dismissed by the Military Board, and representations made to the Minister of Defence by Mr. P. J. O'Regan, counsel for the Miners' Federation and the Grey political Labour bodies, produced negative results.

Under date March 7, 1918, the following letter was addressed to Sir James Allen by Mr. Webb:—

Sir,—In view of the replies sent to Mr. O'Regan in answer to that gentleman's representations in my behalf under instructions from the New Zealand Coalminers' Federation and the Grey District Labour Council, I feel it incumbent upon me to address this letter to you.

First, I would remind you that a General Election took place in 1914, notwithstanding the fact that the war was then raging and that the enemy was threatening Paris. On that occasion the Grey electors returned me with an increased majority. From the soldiers entitled to vote in the electorate, I received almost unanimous support, and they in particular requested me to look after their interests and the interests of their dependants, and solicited my assistance in protesting against the shameful manner in which their dependants were being exploited by means of unnecessarily excessive prices. I have done my best to conform to their wishes, but being in a minority in Parliament, have been powerless to do more than protest. Further, my soldier-constituents expressed the wish that, in the event of their

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

returning to New Zealand incapacitated, suitable employment should be found for them, together with reasonable recompense for their injuries. Again, I have complied with their wishes in that connection, and have protested emphatically against the way in which many disabled men are being turned adrift unable to follow their ordinary occupations, and yet deprived of pensions. That the Government has failed lamentably to cope with the problem of excessive prices, and that men who have returned disabled are not being properly provided for is due to no fault of mine, inasmuch as I have repeatedly drawn attention to these grievances.

After my election in 1914, I stated publicly that if the Grey electors considered my services more essential at the front than in Parliament, on receipt of a requisition, signed by 1000 electors, I would resign my seat and abide by the will of the majority of the constituency. No requisition was ever presented, and on my being balloted for military service, numerous signed petitions were presented from my electorate and from the West Coast generally, asking for my exemption, and I may say that the signatories to these petitions included a large number of parents who had sons at the front as well as a considerable number of returned soldiers and men in camp. Moreover, these requisitions were supported by the whole of the miners' organisations of this country. The Military Service Board, however, saw fit to ignore these representations, and dismissed the appeal, although the said Board has repeatedly granted exemption in other cases on much more slender grounds. I then resigned my seat and placed myself unreservedly in the hands of my constituents, who re-elected me without opposition. My constituents then asked for a re-hearing of my appeal, but this was refused without anyone being heard in support. Now that my constituents are to be denied the right of representation, in that I am not to be allowed to prepare for and attend regularly in my place in Parliament during the coming session, I feel that but one honourable course is open to me. I have either to remain true to my constituents or obey the command of a Board which, they believe, has not treated my case judicially, and which I believe to have been influenced by a strong spirit of political prejudice against me. In other words, I have resolved to disobey the Board and to take the consequences. Incidentally, I intend my action as a protest against the utter failure of your Government to deal fairly with the disabled soldiers and their dependants or indeed with the masses of the people of this country. That your Government has failed lamentably in its duty by the returned soldiers and their dependants and by the masses of the people of this country is fully evidenced by the fact that it has won the support of every person who profits by the sufferings of the masses of his fellow-citizens. Perhaps under the circumstances it is only common gratitude on the part of such people that they should have sent their motor-cars to assist in defeating the representative of Labour in the recent by-election. I

P. C. WEBB, M.P.

would add that it is not surprising that a Government with such a record as yours should have postponed a General Election.

In conclusion, I may state that my address is Post Office Box 1500, Wellington.

I have the honour to remain, Sir, yours truly,

P. C. WEBB.

On March 11, at Wellington, Mr. Webb was entertained at luncheon by representatives of the industrial and political Labour movement; and at 2.30 on the same day he was arrested and conveyed to Trentham by the military. On March 22 he was courtmartialled at Trentham, when he pleaded guilty to the charge of disobeying an order. He, however, desired to state his position. During the course of his address he was repeatedly interrupted by the Court. When he made the charge that discrimination had been employed by the Boards, he was ruled out. He was also prevented from referring to the Laidlaw case to illustrate his argument. When he showed how the police had been specially exempted, and contended that a member of Parliament was just as essential as a policeman, he was told: "The Board does not think that Parliament can be regarded as essential. It thinks that the men at the head of affairs are capable of governing the country." (To many in the Labour movement this remark read like a clear indication of the extent to which the military mind is capable of travelling in the direction of oligarchic rule.) Mr. Webb remarked that this resembled the autocracy the war was ostensibly being fought to crush, and the President ruled out all reference to autocracy. Shortly after this the President informed Mr. Webb that the people of New Zealand, through the Government, had told him to go to the front. Mr. Webb retorted that he was elected to oppose the Government, and that his constituents were entitled to consideration anyhow. The President then lectured Mr. Webb on the text that the New Zealand Government was much more clear-sighted than some other governments. Mr. Webb thought this was a matter the people might be left to decide, and when the President remarked that the people had elected the Government, Mr. Webb reminded him that the issue then was not Conscription. Mr. Webb, continuing, pointed out the implications of Conscription in that under the prevalent secret diplomacy men could be compelled to fight for principles their own governments had denounced. He said it was, therefore, autocracy and despotism. The President said the Court was in possession of enough information to judge the "accused's" attitude, and thought he ought to sit down. He also drew attention to the capacity of the Court to understand the Labour problem. All its members had been two years at the front, and knew the feelings of the soldiers. Later on he delivered a homily on the virtues of supporting the Government, else the victory of Germany would destroy the freedom of Labour members of Parliament and everybody else. He said that "if 'Private' Webb

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

believed that the Government he had been maligning did not contain any man capable of looking after the interests of his constituents he was justified in his attitude." Mr. Webb was just about to interject upon the President's verbosity that he had "good justification in that case because my constituents would certainly not allow themselves to be represented by any member of the Government," when Colonel MacDonald saw fit to check the President by remarking "that the 'accused' should be allowed to make his statements and only interrupted when he has to be stopped." At this the President subsided into a silence long enough for Mr. Webb to finish his speech without further interruption. Concluding, Mr. Webb said that it was evident that had he the eloquence of a Gladstone or an O'Connell he would not be able to secure a mitigation of his sentence. He had no regret for the stand he was taking. He asked for no clemency. He was proud to be able to carry his principles to the prison gates. If his principles were not worth suffering for they were not worth having. He was sure the day would come when the Government would pay the penalty for its outrage against his constituency and for the policy of oppression and exploitation it had pursued ever since the war began.

When the sentence of the Court was promulgated, it proved to be the usual two years' hard labour; and Mr. Webb was taken to the prison camp on the Kaingaroa Plateau, near Rotorua, to serve his term, which will have expired ere this book is in the readers' hands.

On April 6 a public demonstration of protest was held at Grey-mouth, the citizens of the Grey Valley generally and the Labour organisations in particular, participating. The following resolution was carried unanimously:—

"That this large gathering of electors of Grey views with indignation the action of the military authorities in seizing and imprisoning Mr. P. C. Webb, M.P., and calls upon the Government to secure and preserve the rights of a member of Parliament to attend to his Parliamentary duties and to provide him with the means of attending to the business of his constituency. We beg to remind the Government that, according to the decision of the Crown Law Officers, Mr. Webb has committed no crime within the meaning of the Legislature Act; and we protest strongly against military authority denying political expression to an electorate of 8000 electors, backed up by the determined effort of 20,000 industrialists, of whom Mr. Webb is the only direct and practical representative and expression. We place before the authorities the case of Mr. Laidlaw, of the firm of Laidlaw Leeds, of Auckland, who was exempted by an Appeal Board to serve the economic interests of his firm, and urge that Mr. Webb's presence in the House and attending to the business of his constituency is an absolute and urgent necessity. We hold that it is an absolute and inalienable right of an electorate to choose its own member of Parliament, and we trust for the sake of political liberty in New Zealand

P. C. WEBB, M.P.

that the Government will ponder long and carefully before it denies this right to the electors of Grey and to the industrial unions of New Zealand, of which Mr. Webb is the only practical exponent in the House of Representatives."

On April 12 a Labour deputation waited upon the Prime Minister, Sir Joseph Ward, Sir James Allen, and Mr. Wilford to urge the unconditional release of Mr. Webb. This deputation included representatives of the Grey Labour Representation Committee, Miners' Federation, United Federation of Labour, New Zealand Labour Party, Drivers' Federation, Seamen's Federation, Tramway Federation, Wellington Trades and Labour Council, Auckland L.R.C., Wellington S.D.P., A.P.U., Waterside Workers' Federation, Enginedrivers' Federation, Wellington L.R.C., Otago Trades and Labour Council, Housewives' Union, Women's International League, and others. Mr. James O'Brien, representing Mr. Webb's constituents, presented the resolution already quoted, and a strong point made by the deputation was that the Imperial Government had not forced any member of the House of Commons from his constituency to the battlefield. The Government, however, refused to accede to the deputation's request, and maintained its attitude notwithstanding that from every part of New Zealand protests came from the Labour movement against the conscription of the Labour M.P.

In April a lightning session of Parliament was held; and, during this session, a motion to grant the Member for Grey leave of absence was defeated. This meant that, although Mr. Webb was held not to be disqualified by the terms of his sentence from remaining a member of the House, his seat became vacant by reason of his absence from the House for one whole session without leave. A fresh election was accordingly called. The industrial and political organisations of Labour in the electorate honoured me with an unopposed selection, and a main feature of the contest was made the Government's Conscription policy and its jailing of Mr. Webb. The Tory and Liberal supporters of the Government consolidated their forces behind the most popular local man who could be induced to stand. With a lively appreciation of the Government's unpopularity, they sought to camouflage their campaign with "Independent" colourings. The result of the contest was a decisive defeat for the Government, and a triumphant vindication of Mr. Webb's attitude.

The imprisonment of Mr. Webb was deeply resented by the returned soldiers in the constituency, as was evidenced by the large deputation of returned men, which, introduced by myself, waited upon the Hon. Mr. Wilford at Greymouth in the early part of this year to demand the release of their late member. It is, perhaps, significant that, with the exception of two local dailies, no newspaper in New Zealand was prepared to print a comprehensive report of this remarkable deputation.

XXI.—IN PRISON AND DETENTION.

Mr. P. C. Webb corresponded with me with unbroken regularity from the date of his incarceration; and I almost invariably put his letters into print. He wrote unselfish letters of encouragement and strength during the Grey campaign; letters of happy congratulation when our victory was recorded; letters full of cheery optimism when the petition failed, and we swept onward to the great victories of Wellington Central and Wellington South. Then the iron heel of repression left its mark. On February 2, 1919, Mr. Webb wrote to me: "Since writing to you last I guess the Prisons Department has issued new Regulations, which prevent me writing anything about Socialism, Industrial Unionism, the causes of and responsibility for many of the imported and locally-produced epidemics. I am not permitted to write anything that reflects on the Government, and must refrain from making any reference to the class war—even the need for its ending. Under no circumstances will I be allowed to express my views on the war or things arising therefrom. Anti-Conscription views must remain in abeyance until I regain my liberty. All political questions are placed in the same category." All that he could now write about would be the weather, his own health, and the health of his friends and kindred subjects. In a subsequent letter, Mr. Webb signed himself "Yours for Socialism." The word "Socialism" was erased by the prison censor, but not sufficiently to make it unreadable—a ridiculous and childlike censorship, in any case.

About this time "Stead's Review"—the one publication that presented a concise and truthful summary of the war situation—was denied admission to the prisons. "Stead's" had up to this time been sent to most of the C.O.'s. The Minister of Justice, in endeavoring to explain his action in this respect, put forward the excuse that "Stead's" had a depressing effect on the prisoners!

An Irish Objector—Mr. Denis Mangan—wrote from Waikeria Prison to a friend outside. His letter is heavily censored, the matter objected to being covered with blue pencilling in the first place and then daubed over with black. He is telling his friend that his time will be up on a certain date in May, and that he and another C.O. will be free in so many weeks from the date of his letter. The figures are blotted out, but the word "May" is left in. The letter concludes: "So good-bye for eight weeks"—words which the Censor apparently overlooked, and the overlooking of which made his other censorship so much wasted effort.

In the first half of 1919 a hunger strike was entered upon at Waikeria. Seven men began to fast as a protest against the whole prison system. Five were Religious Objectors, one Socialist, and one Irish. One man, suffering with cramps, took food on the eleventh day. The

IN PRISON AND DETENTION.

others went to the twelfth day, when it is alleged the strike was called off as the result of a visit to the prison of the mother of one of them.

At Papanui (Templeton) a strike occurred, when a West Coaster refused to do "fire drill." He told the prison authorities that he had been jailed for his principles and deprived of his franchise, and they need not wonder if he didn't care if their old jail did get burnt down. He was "dummied," and a number of the other Objectors went on a sympathy strike, and were "locked up." In due time a magistrate came, and they were tried and deprived of their "privileges" for one month.

In Kaingaroa, where in the intensely cold weather the Objectors were in the habit of taking down their blankets to keep themselves warm on the wet days when they did not go out to work, an order that the blankets must not be taken was disregarded by Mr. P. C. Webb and others, and the outcome was a magisterial inquiry, the result of which is not available at the time of writing.

Mr. Robert Gould, a Wellington waterside worker imprisoned at Waikeria, whose wife was ill, asked to be transferred to Wellington to be near her. When his request was refused, he struck work and food, and was "locked up." Mr. John Brailsford, B.A., then struck work and food as a protest against Gould's treatment. Both Gould and Brailsford were removed to Mt. Eden. Mr. Gould's hunger strike lasted seven days. He was eventually transferred to Wellington.

Mr. Harry Urquhart, after his release, wrote me that when one man fell ill at Waikeria, no change of underclothing was given him for over a fortnight, and no provision was made for a bath or sponge-down of any sort. The food supplied to him was greasy and unpalatable until complaint was made. Only once, when he was very ill, it was alleged, was an attempt made to take this man's temperature, and then the thermometer was accidentally broken. The patient was locked up in his solitary cell during the night hours; and if he used the night utensils they could not be emptied until morning. The other C.O.'s deputed Mr. Urquhart to interview the jailer about the case, but the only satisfaction he got was permission to see the doctor re the matter. The doctor, however, peremptorily ordered Mr. Urquhart out of the office, and told him that it would be time enough for him to complain when he himself was in the hospital and dissatisfied with his own treatment. He was further told that the man himself had not complained—which, he says, was probably true, since his particular religion would prevent him from doing so.

One of the Objectors, William White, died at Mt. Eden in January last. According to the statements of men who were his fellow-prisoners, White was brought from Waimarino Camp to Mt. Eden on January 18. He was transferred for medical treatment, being sick and unable to work. It is alleged that he did not receive medical attention until January 24—six days after his arrival, and that he was given no

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

special consideration in the matter of diet. Mr. Brailsford explains that Mt. Eden diet was at this time dry bread and porridge and tea without milk morning and evening, and at midday very coarse beef, potatoes, and sometimes a tiny portion of carrot or other vegetable, with fish on Fridays. The menu did not include either milk, butter, or treacle. On the Saturday before his death (it is asserted) White was deprived of his tobacco allowance for doing insufficient work. His work, it may be explained, was "napping" road metal. The night before his death he was heard knocking to attract attention, and some of the prisoners make the charge that no attention was paid to him. In the morning, at 6.45, his breakfast was pushed in. When the warder came back to lock him in at 7.45, White pleaded that the door might be left open, saying that he "hadn't a friend in the world and was feeling very bad." The door was not left open. When the other prisoners returned from physical drill, White was rolling about and sweating in agony in his hammock, and there was vomit on the floor of his cell. It is alleged that a little later White was told by an official that if he got out into the fresh air and did some light work he would feel better. Not long after this the doctor came, and at once ordered the man into the prison hospital, where he died almost immediately. His fellow-prisoners complain that when the inquest was held a number of them who could have given important evidence were not called. The verdict was that death was due to heart trouble. On the public platform I have repeatedly made the demand that this case should be investigated, but my demand has so far been without effect.

A young school-teacher, writing to his mother, says: "The jail is full of nothing but Objectors. The doctor asks the prisoners what they are in for. If they are Objectors, God pity them if they are ill." He adds that a soldier was "brought here and made to do salute drill for two hours on end, until he was exhausted, because he failed to salute an officer down the street."

Another letter from one of the prisoners contains the news that "the Israelite has been 16 days hunger-striking, and is still going strong. He takes nothing but water." This refers to an Objector who belongs to the Christian Israelites.

In a letter from an imprisoned Objector to a friend, by whom it was sent on to me, the writer, who is a well-known watersider, says: "I was dragged out of bed to-night at 9 o'clock for asking for more and better food, and making a complaint about the food supplied being unwholesome. Treated like a dog." This note was scribbled with a pencil (in the "express for Auckland") on a leaf torn from a notebook.

A C.O. wrote to his wife from one of the "clinks": "I am well and spiritually happy. But, oh, the hardships I have seen other men endure. I have had to cry—I couldn't help it." The same letter mentions that "one imprisoned returned soldier got word that his

IN PRISON AND DETENTION.

mother was dying. They would not let him go to see her. Then a wire came to say she was dead. Even then he did not get away." "And," the writer added, "he was only in prison for hitting a red-cap."

A degrading and revolting practice in the prisons is what is known as "searching." Prisoners are searched at intervals for contraband. The prisoner is required to strip himself naked, and his clothes and person are then scrutinised by the warders. While I was in the Terrace Jail at Wellington the system was described to me by prisoners who had often undergone the process. Some of them told me of disgusting and humiliating methods employed by the worst of the officials. Of course, the better class of official hates the work as much as the prisoner hates the experience. It has been reported to me that Mr. Donald Baxter, for refusing to submit to this degradation, was deprived of his "privileges" for a given time. In other words, if my information is correct, and I have no reason to doubt its authenticity, Mr. Baxter was prevented from writing to his mother, from receiving either letters or visitors, and from enjoying other smaller privileges because he would not debase himself to the extent required by the prison regulations. It is needless to say that a vile custom of this nature is as morally destructive to the official who performs it as it is to the prisoner on whom it is inflicted. It is a regulation that, in the interests of common decency, must go.

XXII.—SOME LETTERS.

I have had sent to me copies of letters—sometimes from mothers, sometimes from fathers almost frantic with grief and suspense—to Lord Liverpool, Mr. Massey, Sir Joseph Ward, and Sir James Allen. Some of these letters were pathetic appeals for human mercy. Some voiced demands for justice, and were full of fierce invective against the men and the class the workers held responsible for their sorrow. One of these was a pathetic appeal to the Minister of Defence from a wife that her husband—"a good father and husband," she says—(who had been removed from the Templeton Prison to Christchurch Hospital, suffering from a relapse consequent on an attack of influenza) might be permitted to be nursed at his home when convalescent.

One letter to myself was from the West Coast. The writer is the wife of a C.O.—a farmer. She enclosed a copy of a letter her husband sent to Sir James Allen. He was the only man on his little farm, and when he was dragged off to prison the farm was faced with ruin. He was only given a little more than a week's notice.

Occasionally a father would write to me that his son had been dragged away by force, that he believed he was in Trentham "clink."

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Occasionally there would come a heart-breaking appreciation of my own efforts on behalf of the C.O.'s; occasionally a pitiful plea that Labour would endeavour to see that no more C.O.'s were forcibly deported. Men wrote to me of their experiences before the attestation officers and the military tribunals.

A Southern Objector (Irish) who was called upon to attest, and refused, wrote: "The officer fairly foamed at me. After a lively exchange of words, however, he took hold of himself and cooled some. Then he invited me into the attesting room, and filled in the usual 24 or 25 lines of questions. He missed out the "present war" lines and asked me to sign. I refused. . . . He tried all manner of means to get me to sign the blank order. Of course, I refused to sign anything. He said he would make it as hard as he could for at the hearing of my appeal. I told him it would be his duty to do that."

A prominent Churchman wrote that a friend of his—also a Catholic—was drawn in the first ballot and refused to answer the call. He was arrested and taken to the Detention Barracks, and severely cross-examined—put through what was next door to the Third Degree—by a certain officer, by whom he was finally told that "as a member of the Catholic Church he could no longer attend his religious duties or receive communion unless he would take the oath and swear to fight for his king and country." Of course, this was scandalously untrue.

A Socialist Objector was told by a renegade Labour man at a sitting of one of the tribunals that he "ought to be thrashed." The man guilty of that outburst was not removed from his position. A Religious Objector wrote that when he informed the Court that his trust was in God, he was told that he "was trusting in a broken reed."

Mr. Maguire wrote to Mr. P. T. Robinson, of the Flaxworkers' Union, an account of his examination and court-martial. "What is your religion?" the President asked. "Roman Catholic," was the answer. Q.: "Are you aware that military service is not going against the rules of your Church?" A.: "Yes; but I don't object from a religious standpoint, but from a conscientious standpoint." Q.: "What is your definition of a Conscientious Objector?" A.: "A man who refuses to be hounded into an army for the purpose of killing others." Q.: "If a maniac came along and tried to kill your mother or sweetheart, and if a gun or sword were close to you would you use them?" A.: "Under the circumstances, yes." "Then," said the officer, "that's what the Germans are doing. You are quite justified in taking the uniform." "No," the prisoner replied; "I should only be preparing for premeditated murder." The officer returned to the attack. Q.: "You are an Irishman?" A.: "Yes." Q.: "Have you any grudge against the English nation as a whole?" A.: "No; but I have against the English aristocracy." Q.: "I see. You prefer to live in luxury and let some one else go and fight for you?" A.: "I never asked anyone to go. In fact, I don't want them to go; and, as for luxury, nobody gets that but our stay-at-home patriots." When asked how he pleaded,

SOME LETTERS.

Mr. Maguire said, as to refusing the uniform, he must be guilty. "Ah, but you had better plead not guilty," said the officer. "We wish to be your friend as well as your judge." How this worked out subsequent events have shown.

Many letters set forth the viewpoint of the Religious Objectors. It will be sufficient to quote one. From Capetown Military Barracks, on October 10, 1917, Mr. A. Sanderson (who had been landed there from the Waitemata because he was ill) wrote to some friends at Lower Hutt:—"I have always had the comfort of the Word wherever I have gone, and especially have I found peace in the sayings of the Lord Jesus concerning His ever-watchful care of His people and the Father's love of them. . . . Love and Light and Peace are in the Father and our Lord, and in us too, if we abide in him. . . . Remember to let it all rest with God in Christ; for He has marked the way for each one of us. So patience. Let us do to-day what is needful and with trust and prayer . . . casting all our care upon Him."

Early in March, 1918, the following came to hand from Mark Briggs:—"Just dropping you a line while I have the chance. I am at Etaples, in France, still in "clink," but just of the same mind as ever. I have had a very rough time of it, but have got through alive so far. I don't know what they intend to do with me, but I am determined to see it through, no matter what the consequences may be. I have had some great experiences. Tell Dad I am getting on as well as can be expected, that my health is good, and that I have still hopes of getting back to see him and all my friends some day. Best wishes to all. Remember me to all my friends; tell them my message is just the same as ever: 'Workers of the world, unite!'; and to my enemies you can say that the spirit of Mark Briggs is still unbroken."

A Christchurch lady—herself the mother of a very talented (and likewise very brave) lad, enduring imprisonment for the sake of his religious principles—wrote to Mrs. Ballantyne (Wellington) on February 3, 1919, of Mr. T. P. Harland, who had just returned from France: "He had a wonderful story to tell. He, like Garth, eventually took medical work, but signed nothing and accepted no pay, though often near starving. They offered him a suit of clothes in Lyttelton, but when he heard he had to sign for it he would have none of it. He is very enthusiastic over Briggs's heroism, and says they all felt that he (Briggs) has the right to be the spokesman for the fourteen; describes him as utterly unbroken intellectually, and able to give every detail of their martyrdom."

XXIII.—VARYING VIEWPOINTS.

During the courtmartial trials of the Conscientious Objectors, very many admirable statements were made by the "accused," presenting the respective viewpoints of the men who were prepared to sacrifice

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

their liberty rather than sear their conscience. The two statements which follow are widely different in viewpoint. The first is the objection of a very sincere Christian; the second that of an equally sincere Socialist—both of them men of lofty principles, firm purpose, and transcending courage.

Mr. Harry R. Urquhart, M.A., made the following statement to the President and members of the Courtmartial by whom he was tried at Auckland on May 9, 1918:—

I am here, as you know, on a charge of refusing to obey a command of one who is termed my superior officer. The command, namely, an order to submit to medical examination, seems so simple and innocent in itself that few people really understand why it is that a man, no matter what his philosophy of life may be, finds any difficulty in obeying it.

When, moreover, it is made clear that by submitting to medical examination there is a chance of being declared unfit for military service and of thus escaping punishment by imprisonment, the position of one who disobeys such an order becomes all the more difficult to comprehend.

Notwithstanding all this, I have very definite reasons for refusing to obey such an order:

1. To submit willingly to medical examination is to give the impression that if a man is found fit he will have no objections to going on with the rest of the full military programme. If this is not so, and, like me, he has really no intention of becoming a soldier, then submission to such an order is a mere farce—a taking part in an absolutely meaningless proceeding. Now, Sir, to me life is too real a thing for such paltry trifling; hence I cannot submit even to this apparently simple and innocent command.

2. An order to submit to medical examination is the first of a long series of military orders. If a man has not the slightest intention of taking the later orders, then he should refuse to take the first; for the sooner his position is made clear to himself and to all others the less confusion of thought will be caused.

3. There is certainly a chance of a man being declared medically unfit as a result of this examination and of thus escaping many unpleasant experiences, and of even being permitted to follow his usual occupation, but, Sir, men who take the stand which I am taking are not seeking to make things easy for themselves—they are only anxious to prove faithful to the light they have, and they would consider it a species of moral cowardice to attempt to slip through a loophole such as the medical examination sometimes affords.

4. It is good, too, for officials to be forced into the position of dealing with men who refuse to obey orders which they know are in direct conflict with the Divine Revelation that is guiding our lives.

Officials from the days of Pontius Pilate have at times been deeply

VARYING VIEWPOINTS.

concerned when they have found themselves, in the execution of what they deem to be their duty, pronouncing sentence on men whom they know to be thoroughly sincere and whose lives show that they seek only the true good of their fellow-men.

Many an official at such a time feels himself a divided creature—he fain would do that as a man which he dare not do as an official. As an official he is forced to condemn and pass sentence on what as a man he would most willingly pardon and condone.

The truth of Christ's teaching may then come home to him with great forcefulness—that no man can serve two masters. He realises, possibly for the first time, that he must act as a man of independent thought or as an official bound down by rules and regulations. He sees clearly the impossibility of serving both God and Mammon, of being true to himself as a man and true to the State as an official.

It may be that he will learn a lesson—one of the most important he will ever learn—that a man must be a man first of all, an official somewhere after that or not at all, according to the light revealed to him.

I am not a Quaker, and never have been one, but I profess to be a follower of Jesus Christ—it may be, like Peter of old, one who follows at a distance—still, I am seeking to follow and, as the days and weeks go by, to lessen the distance which separates my life from that of the Master.

I feel very definitely the leading of Christ—that Divine guidance which is promised to every man who seeks it. With the pathway so definitely pointed out to me, it would be base treachery on my part to obey commands, even of the highest officials of the land, when those commands mean the surrender of the light I have and the treading of a pathway which I know to be fraught with darkness and confusion.

The question of paramount importance to me, then, is not how should the crowd who have not this light act, but how should the few who have it act?

In such a crisis as the present it is assumed that the individual cannot do any independent thinking, or, if he does, it is deemed to be valueless. Now, history right down through the ages has proved such an assumption to be false. It has not been men in masses but men in ones and twos who have been responsible in the first place for the change of thought which has led to important reforms. A law, then, which ignores such a fundamental axiom of all true progress is a law which every wise man will expect to be broken.

Even granted that the Christian were willing to wear the uniform and accept military pay, although as a matter of fact he could not possibly identify himself so closely with your philosophy of life without most gravely and seriously jeopardising the cause for which he stands, still the military authorities on their part could not possibly allow him to enlist, because—however willing he might be to allow

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

his body to be clothed with a military uniform—he certainly will not and cannot permit any earthly authority to dress his thoughts in a uniform of approved pattern. In other words, you may dress him in a uniform and so make him look like you, but you can never force him to think like you. If he goes at all, he must go as a free man and speak those things which God moves him to say. Right along the line he would be a source of danger to you, for one Christian in your ranks who is convinced of the sinfulness of the whole military position would be a constant source of danger to your cause. You dare not let him go—it would be madness on your part to seek to force him to go.

The true Christian follows the light as far as God reveals it to him. The truer he is to this revealed guidance the more light he receives and the less the world understands him. It is perhaps sufficient if he understands himself. But, as he steps more and more from the line which the world thinks it wisest to follow, as he diverges more and more from that path which is mapped out by convention and expediency, the more impossible does it become for him to accept freely a line of life or a definite work set down by another. Hence the Christian may find it impossible to accept alternative non-combatant work. Your only course is to leave him alone to follow that plan which God has revealed to him.

To me the words of John concerning Christ—that He is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world—and the words of Jesus Christ Himself when He says, "I am the way, the truth and the life," are fraught with very deep meaning. I realise that he who ventures to seek and to follow this light must expect to come into conflict with conventional ideas as to what is and what is not expedient. He must be prepared to oppose popular opinion; he must, even at the risk of being misrepresented and misunderstood, very definitely refuse to move a step out of that pathway which is pointed out to him by Divine Revelation.

Such a follower of Christ will walk with all men as far as he possibly can—he will not lightly nor willingly break the laws of his country; but he reserves, and must reserve, to himself the right to break any law, military or otherwise, which comes into conflict with that Divine law revealed from above.

At a time like the present he arrives at the parting of the ways. Two voices speak to him—there is first that of the military authorities, loud and insistent, but to the Christian there is yet another voice—still and quiet—a voice which can be heard only when the soul of man is hushed to stillness and is eagerly listening for it.

I hear most distinctly these two voices. I see the beckoning figures, pointing out their opposing ways; but in my heart and mind lingers no bewildering doubt. I obey, gladly and willingly, the voice and beckoning hand of Him whom alone I regard as my superior officer.

Multitudes cannot understand such a philosophy of life; but this is

VARYING VIEWPOINTS.

only another proof of the marvellous accuracy of Christ's knowledge of men when He predicted that such would be the case—for He said, "The world cannot receive the Spirit of Truth because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him."

The Prosecuting Counsel has told you that I am a soldier; that the Military Service Act of 1916 has created me one in spite of my opposition to the whole military programme. I should like to say, Mr. President, that you cannot make a soldier of a man by Act of Parliament, any more than you can make a Hindu of him by a similar process. To make a soldier of a man you must secure him both body and soul. No Government has yet been able to do this. The fact that there are scores of Objectors in your prisons is proof that an Act of Parliament cannot make soldiers of men against their wills—it can only make prisoners of them, and as such they are not a help but a hindrance to your cause.

So, when the Prosecuting Counsel tells me that in refusing to obey a military command I am committing the gravest offence that can be preferred against a soldier, I am not overwhelmed with dismay. I regard his own position as an infinitely more serious one—for, in stating that the religious or conscientious scruples of an accused man can have no weight with the Court and must not receive any consideration, he takes up arms not against me, but against God Himself. Sir, you are surely not amazed when I tell you that, in spite of the so-called grave offence I have committed against military law, I infinitely prefer my position to that of any member of this Court, for my offence is one against the law of man alone; yours, against the law and will of God Himself.

Mr. Colin R. Robertson was courtmartialled at Auckland on Friday, December 7, 1918, for refusing to be a soldier. When requested by the Court to state his personal objections to military service, he made the following statement, to which the Court listened patiently and without any interruptions whatever. He said:—

I am a Socialist, therefore my objections to service in the N.Z.E.F. as a conscript are based entirely on Socialist principles. I am opposed to conscription because, first, it is against the best interest of humanity, it is a machine of war's creation for war waging, and no one, I think, would dare say that war in itself is in humanity's interests.

Secondly, it is undemocratic, especially so in the manner in which it has been ushered into New Zealand.

War is the product of the system of social organisation, or rather disorganisation, under which we in this age live. It is the product of any social system under which the many are economically dependent on the few for the right to work in order that they may obtain the means of subsistence.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Under the capitalistic state of society the working-class receive only a small portion of the wealth they produce in the form of wages; the balance is retained by the capitalists in the form of rent, interest, and profit. The balance becomes capital, and the capitalists seek fresh fields for its profitable investment.

Since the capitalists of all countries are in the same position, they must compete one with the other for the limited fields in which this accumulated capital can be profitably employed. Their interests conflict, war ensues; thus, to my mind, the causes of all wars are economic, all are capitalistic.

In the war being waged in Europe to-day, I see clearly the clashing of capitalistic interests; the same envious glances cast by one nation at the trade of another that precede all wars preceded this one.

These things do not concern the working-class of any country. Go where you will you will find the workers are dependent on the capitalists for the right to live; go where you will, you will find the workers living in the same poverty and want, you will find the same jails, lunatic asylums, poor-houses, brothels, and all the other evils of our present wage-system. Therefore, it will be seen the workers of all countries have the same troubles—to wit, an insufficiency of the necessities of life. They are all alike struggling to improve their lot by striving for higher wages, shorter hours of labour, and more sanitary conditions of life, all struggling to secure a little more of the wealth they produce, and ultimately to secure their independence from the economic oppression of capitalism.

I realise this and therefore refuse to participate in this or any other war. We are told it is a war of freedom. Freedom from what? The only freedom I can see to strive for is freedom of the masses of wage-slaves from their want and misery, freedom from the economic oppression of capitalism.

We are told it is to punish the perpetrators of the horrors (real or alleged) on the women and children of Belgium. To that I would reply: that, if there is anything in the natural law that every crime brings its own punishment, then the crimes that were practised upon the unfortunate natives of the Congo in the interests of Belgian capital, are bringing theirs. The unfortunate part is, that many of the guiltless workers of Belgium are suffering along with those who were responsible.

We are told it is to secure for the small nations independence; to that I would reply: If that is the case, why is not independence granted to Finland by Russia and to Ireland by Britain?

I am opposed to participation in this war or any other, on the grounds that all wars are wrong and against the best interests of humanity.

I refuse to hate the working-class men and women of Germany or any other country allied to her; I refuse to slay and maim the workers of those countries. I refuse to be the cause of depriving any German

VARYING VIEWPOINTS.

woman of her life's partner, and I decline to be the means of any child of Germany shedding one tear over the loss of a living father.

For these reasons I must decline to be a soldier, or recognise the right of any Government to force me to become one. I must decline to recognise the right of any orders given to me by an alleged superior officer; therefore, I have declined to be medically examined, especially when I know that such examination is only for the purpose of determining my physical fitness to take human life.

I seek to make this world a little better for my having been in it, than it may otherwise have been, and participation in war is not tending towards that ideal.

I quite realise that for my views and principles I shall have to undergo certain punishment, but however severe that may be, even should it involve execution, I would still maintain the same attitude.

I would rather suffer the agonies of a million hells for a period of time covering a million eternities than develop legs on my stomach and crawl, centipede fashion, into a heaven (there to bask in the sunshine of an orthodox God) by violating the principle of humanitarianism, which I hold dearer than life itself.

Finally, I definitely state that I decline to perform one single action that would tend to leave what is now the live pulsating body of a German working man, with hopes and ideals perhaps the same as mine, on a bloodstained field of battle a mangled mass of humanity, with the life-blood welling from great gaping wounds, enriching the earth from which he sprung and to which he will now return.

Mr. Robertson then proceeded to make the following offer:—

I am prepared to offer myself to the military authorities for one purpose and on one condition. It is only by research and experiment that medical science has reached the stage of development that it has. It can only advance by still further research and experiment. This war has provided many opportunities for the advancement of anti-septic surgery, many operations have been performed which before the war were considered impossible. Many cases, I believe, of transfusion of blood, grafting of skin, flesh, or bone, etc., have been successfully dealt with.

Now, I am a healthy individual. I have lived a clean life, have no vices that I know of such as drinking, smoking, etc., have never had a day's constitutional illness in my life, so would consider that my blood, bone, and flesh would be in a good enough condition, that portion of my body could be grafted on to the bodies of individuals who may have been maimed, with a reasonable hope of the injured person being benefitted.

I therefore am prepared to offer my body to the military authorities for use in any hospital for the purpose herein stated for the benefit of any soldier who has been maimed at the front. The only

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

condition I impose is that no soldier after such treatment shall be re-ordered to the front.

I make this offer in the hope that it will be accepted, and that because I really wish to do something for the good of humanity. For the sake of the millions yet unborn and with the hope that the knowledge of surgery may be increased for the purpose of minimising the sufferings of those unborn millions may be heir to, I make this offer, it being the only way I can conscientiously assist the military authorities.

XXIV.—WANGANUI REVELATIONS.

I have already mentioned that the treatment of the Conscientious Objectors was made a part of the Labour Party's indictment of the National Government in the Grey campaign. My last election address in that fight was delivered at Reefton on the eve of the polling day, May 27. On my arrival at Reefton I found that Mr. Mark Fagan, secretary of the Inangahua Miners' Union, had that day received a letter from Mr. Harry Wilson, a member of the Union, and also a C.O., describing the treatment of himself and other C.O.'s at Wanganui Detention Prison. Mr. Wilson's letter was dated May 23, and had been written from Alexandra Detention Barracks at Wellington. He first of all recounted his own experiences after being drawn in the ballot and while "wanted," his arrest, his first sentence of 28 days' detention, his second refusal to accept the kit, and his consequent remand for court-martial, which trial he was awaiting at the time of writing. He casually mentioned that he had met quite a number of C.O.'s since he had been seized—"men who have completed eleven months' sentences and are back again for their two years"—and then proceeded to say:—

"We spent part of our detention at Wanganui Barracks, and that is what I want to let you know most about, as I think it wants as much light thrown on it as possible. I want you to give Harry Holland the following particulars regarding the conduct of that place so that he may be able to use it in his election campaign, though I am afraid there will not be very much time after this arrives, still I hope he will make the most of it there, and also through the medium of 'The Worker.' What I have to complain about is the treatment meted out to Conscientious Objectors at Wanganui. Half-a-dozen of us, including three C.O.'s, were taken up there a little over three weeks ago, evidently with the intention of breaking us in. We had not been in the place an hour when I was given three days 'dummy' on bread and water for refusing to 'Sir' the officer in charge, and next

WANGANUI REVELATIONS.

day Tom Moynihan was handed out forty-eight hours of the same for some like trivial offence. I had three days' fast and Tom had nothing to eat while he was in either. Dry bread does not appeal very strongly to either of us. We had not been out twenty-four hours before I fell foul of the officer again and this time was ordered two hours' pack drill. To do pack drill the victim must have a uniform, and as I had none they decided to get one for me. When it arrived I refused to put it on, but that did not trouble them much; they just chucked me around the cell a bit to let me know they were not joking, and when I still refused to change, one brave hero went and got a pair of handcuffs, and after cuffing my hands behind my back, stood me on my feet, and then playfully bashed my head against the wall, stunning me for a few seconds. They continued knocking me about a while longer, and then decided, as I would not put the uniform on, to put it on for me, which they did, being not over gentle in the operation.

"The next one to be operated on was Tom Moynihan. Tom is well known on the Coast. They brought him a uniform one Sunday morning and ordered him to dress in it. Of course, Tom was having none, so three or four hopped into him, and after handing out punches and kicks, one of which landed over the heart, and which he still feels the effects of, they put the uniform on him and ordered him two hours' pack drill. He refused to carry a rifle and also refused to march, so they tied the gun to his side, and then started him off round the yard, by turns pushing, punching, kicking, and dragging him by the hair of his head. Whenever they pushed him off his feet, as they did on several occasions, they put the boot into him until he got up again. This sort of thing went on for over an hour, and the language of the whole crowd was absolutely disgusting. Rather nice exercise for Sunday morning.

"The next victim, a new arrival, was dealt with the next evening less than an hour after he arrived. They introduced a little variation for him. Instead of the gun and pack, they handcuffed him and then proceeded to drag him round with ropes round his neck until he could scarcely stand; they also made a point of pushing him against the wall at each turn, so that by the time they had finished both sides of his face were like a piece of raw steak. To finish up with they gave him a cold bath.

"When the rest of us went out to wash (we were always locked up when any business of this kind was on), we saw splashes of blood all round the yard and also on the walls. . . . If these outrages were perpetrated by Germans they would be condemned as brutal atrocities; but, of course, I am sure the people of New Zealand do not know what is going on in Wanganui, and it is up to those of us that do know to expose it as much as possible and also demand an enquiry into the treatment of Objectors in that hell, otherwise they will go just a little too far one of these days and kill somebody. . . .

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Perhaps the Military authorities imagine they are making soldiers by this sort of treatment, but, as far as I can see, they are just manufacturing rebels. Lieutenant Crampton is in charge of the Barracks.

"Hoping this arrives in time for Harry to make use of it, and also hoping he sends it along for all it is worth. With regards to old chums, sincerely hoping they are all doing well and keeping fit.—I remain, fraternally yours, HARRY WILSON.

"The following is the list of those who were witnesses to what occurred, and who authorise me to sign their names:—Jim Casey, Thos. Moynihan, R. G. Halkett, J. Boyle, A. Beaton. J. Fitzpatrick, T. Bell, H. Wilson."

That evening I quoted for the benefit of a crowded meeting the statement contained in Mr. Wilson's letter. This was the first occasion on which a public exposure was made of the Wanganui cruelties. On reaching Christchurch, on my way back to Wellington after the election had been won, I received a letter from Mrs. Beck (secretary of the Women's International League), who had received a similar letter to that sent to Mr. Fagan, and who urged that I should endeavour to arrange a deputation to Sir James Allen for the purpose of both protesting against and ventilating the outrages. Arriving home the first week in June, I speedily got into communication with the Minister's office. On Tuesday, June 11, I 'phoned Mr. Dixon (Sir James Allen's private secretary) asking him to endeavour to arrange with the Minister to receive a deputation of Labour bodies and other organisations with reference to the alleged ill-treatment of Religious, Socialist, and other Conscientious Objectors in detention and prison in New Zealand and abroad. Mr. Dixon replied by 'phone next day saying that the Minister suggested that, to save both time and expense, we should make our representations in writing. This suggestion I placed before the organisers of the deputation, whose opinion was that the deputation ought to take place—an opinion that I fully concurred in. Accordingly, on June 14 I addressed a letter to the Minister urging that he should consent to receive the deputation, and pointing out that the outrages which were alleged to have been committed were so extremely serious that the matter ought to receive immediate attention, and finally requesting that the Minister would take the deputation on Thursday of the following week. To this letter the Minister replied on June 19, regretting that his time had been too much occupied to permit him to make an appointment or receive the deputation as desired, and adding:—

"Departmental enquiries had, however, been held about Wanganui prior to the receipt of your letter, and, indeed, prior to your original enquiry by telephone. I am anxious that the public should be satisfied that everything is being done to ascertain the truth of the rumours, and have already arranged with the Minister of Justice that a Magistrate shall go fully into the question. This enquiry should be held

WANGANUI REVELATIONS.

within the next day or two. In the circumstances, do you still think it still necessary to hold the deputation?"

It is necessary to digress here to point out that a letter containing similar facts to those covered in the letters to Mr. Fagan and Mrs. Beck had also been sent to the editor of "Truth," by whom it had been submitted to the Defence authorities; and, when the Government eventually took action, it issued its instructions as though the letter to "Truth" was the sole matter it had to go upon. It will, however, be noted that the letter of instruction to the Magistrate, Mr. Hewitt, was dated June 20—the day following the Minister's reply to my letter of June 14, and the exact day on which my second letter was delivered to the Minister.

To return to the correspondence. On June 20 I replied to Sir James Allen (my letter being delivered by special messenger), stating that there was a unanimous wish on the part of those concerned that the deputation should take place on the following day (Friday), or, if this was not possible, at 10.30 or 11 a.m. on Saturday, as on the latter day I was booked to leave for Auckland by the mid-day express. Sir James answered promptly by wire on the same day, regretting that, owing to his own contemplated departure from Wellington on the following Monday, he could not arrange to meet the deputation on either Friday or Saturday as desired, but intimating that he would be returning to Wellington on June 30.

This meant a delay that was altogether too long in the opinion of the deputationists, and on June 21—all efforts to secure the deputation having apparently proved futile—I wrote to the Minister expressing regret at his inability to meet the deputation. In the course of my letter, which was necessarily lengthy, I said:—

"Under these circumstances, and in view of the delay which must take place before they could otherwise be heard, the members of the proposed deputation have asked me to furnish you with an outline of the main facts which they desired to bring under your notice.

"They also desire me to make the strongest possible protest against the Magisterial inquiry re Wanganui Prison being conducted in camera. They insist that the public have a right to hear the evidence from both sides; and they further protest that an inquiry at which the men most concerned will not be entitled to be directly represented, and apparently some of whom will not even be called as witnesses, will not have any very satisfying effect so far as the general public is concerned.

"The principal facts in possession of the parties desiring the deputation are as under:—

"It is alleged that one Conscientious Objector who was taken to Wanganui Prison about the end of April last, was threatened by an officer, subjected to 24 hours in the punishment cell for refusing drill,

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

then sentenced to another 24 hours for 'insolence'—his judge and accuser being the same officer. When he refused to put on the uniform he was forcibly dressed, and was knocked down and kicked in the ribs while down. He eventually took the uniform off. He was forcibly dressed a second time, and was again knocked about, and told that if he took the uniform off again he would be murdered. He again took it off, and was yet again forcibly dressed. This time he had an 80lb. pack fastened on his back and a rifle was tied to his hand. While his hands were tied his head was bumped against the wall; then he was pushed out into the yard, ordered to march, and struck between the shoulders with the butt of a rifle. This caused the rifle fastened to him to fall from its position. He was ordered to hold the rifle up, one of the guards telling him if he failed to do so he would knock his b—— head off. He refused to hold it, and the guard banged it up against his ear and the side of his face till the blood was streaming down his face. After that they tied the rifle with thick string to his neck so that it couldn't fall. They then ordered him once more to march; and when he refused, they took it in turns two at a time to force him round the ring and punched him till he was black and blue. He was then dragged along by the hair of the head. A handful of hair was dragged out. This was more than he could stand, and he struck his assailant and knocked him down, whereupon he was rushed by three of the guards, struck, knocked down, and kicked while down. Asked by an officer was he going to give in, and replying that he was not, he was subjected to still further assault, was knocked down three times, kicked on the shins and banged against the wall. An officer threatened him that he would get this treatment every day as long as he was there. During one of these series of assaults, he was kicked over the heart, and suffered for weeks as a result. Eventually, worn out physically and mentally, he gave in and took the uniform.

"It is further alleged that another Conscientious Objector, refusing to take the uniform, was forcibly dressed in denims, handcuffed, and then dragged round the yard by means of a rope tied round his neck. He was kicked and punched at the same time and pushed against the wall, and at last (it is alleged) 'his face was like a piece of steak, and drops of blood were to be seen all round the yard and on the wall.' He was beaten on the hand with a stick and his hand was swollen abnormally. After having been subjected to this treatment, he was forcibly given a cold bath.

"A number of other Objectors are alleged to have received practically similar treatment."

I also gave the Minister an outline of the Featherston cases referred to in my Wellington North opening speech, and reminded him that Mr. Massey, after that speech, had told the press that the matter would be enquired into—a promise which had not been kept. I also dealt at some length with the cases of the deported men, and parti-

WANGANUI REVELATIONS.

cularly with the statement that they had been subjected to "crucifixion," otherwise Field Punishment No. 1, pointing out that, so far as I knew, neither Australia nor Canada would tolerate the infliction of this punishment on their soldiers, and urging that the New Zealand Government should make the strongest representations to the Imperial military authorities to the same effect. In this letter I also urged, on behalf of the deputation:—

1. That an open and full enquiry be held concerning the treatment of the Conscientious Objectors—both in New Zealand and in England and France.

2. That the fourteen deported men be returned to New Zealand for the purpose of this enquiry, as well as a matter of correct policy.

3. That the men who are alleged to have suffered the persecution described have the right to be represented by counsel, and that no restriction be placed on them in the matter of calling witnesses from among the military prisoners and guards.

4. That the military officers implicated in the alleged illegal treatment of Conscientious Objectors be relieved of their duties pending the investigation of their conduct, and, if found guilty, discharged from the service and called upon to answer charges in the civil courts.

5. That Wanganui Prison be transferred from military to civil control.

I concluded with the intimation that I was taking the liberty of handing the whole of the correspondence to the press early the following week, and that I took it as a matter of course that Sir James would have no objection to this being done.

I departed for Auckland on June 22 as I had arranged to do, leaving the copies of the foregoing letters for insertion in the following week's "Worker." I addressed a huge meeting on the subject of the C.O.'s in the Lyric Theatre, Auckland, on Sunday evening, at which meeting a motion was unanimously carried protesting against the Magisterial Inquiry being held in camera, and on Monday, June 24, left for Rotorua, visiting Mr. P. C. Webb at Kaingaroa on Tuesday, June 25. Returning from Rotorua I found that the papers of Thursday had reprinted from the "Worker" the substance of my statements to the Minister—and the whole of New Zealand was at last in possession of the major facts concerning happenings most people never dreamed could take place in this country.

After journeying to Masterton and Napier, where I spoke for the local Labour Party branches, I returned to Wellington, and found a letter awaiting me from Sir James Allen, dated June 24, asking for the names of prisoners and officers referred to in my letter of June 21, and also asking what I meant by "crucifixion" when I referred to Field Punishment No. 1. The Minister's letter concluded:—

"I am having inquiry made about Archibald Baxter by telegram. In reply to the specific points mentioned by you, I have to say that

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

full inquiry will be held concerning the treatment of Conscientious Objectors in New Zealand, and further inquiry will be made in England and France. I regret that I cannot promise to bring back the fourteen deported men. I can see no good reason for the men being represented by counsel, but am having further inquiry made on this question. No restriction will be placed upon the men calling witnesses from among the military prisoners and guards. If any military men are implicated they will be dealt with. The Wanganui Detention Barracks were established in order that the men might be saved from any possible stigma that might be attached to being in civil prisons. If reform is necessary at Wanganui Detention Barracks reform will be instituted."

Referring to my proposal to give the correspondence to the press, the Minister gave it as his opinion that it would be wiser to wait until the inquiry was concluded, when, he said, the public would be able to judge with the real facts before them.

To Sir James's request for names, etc., I replied, in effect, that we should be ready to furnish these when an open inquiry was held.

In due time I received a letter from Colonel Tate, Adjutant-General, dated 27th June, and setting forth:—"The matter of counsel appearing at the inquiry into the allegations of cruelty at the Wanganui Detention Barracks has been submitted to Mr. Hewitt, Stipendiary Magistrate, who is conducting the inquiry, and I am directed by the Hon. the Minister of Defence to inform you that Mr. Hewitt has replied to the effect that, at present, he does not propose to permit representations by counsel, but should he at a later stage consider such representations necessary, and likely to be useful to him, he will so intimate."

Public meetings and the ordinary meetings of Trade Unions and political Labour bodies carried resolutions protesting against a secret inquiry. A meeting of the Second Division League demanded a public investigation, and some of the newspapers backed up the demand.

The inquiry was duly conducted by Mr. Hewitt, but, in the meantime, the prisoners had been scattered to different prisons, and some of the officials had likewise been either given "leave of absence without pay" or transferred. It is said, with how much truth I do not know, that this policy had been adopted to prevent statements being "concocted" in connection with the inquiry. In addition, a number of the witnesses had been forcibly embarked—"shanghaied" was the term the prisoners themselves used to describe the process. These were men who had gone into camp and donned the uniform, afterwards deserting and when arrested refusing to undertake service. Their position was, of course, greatly different from that of the C.O.'s. The scattering of the men meant that the Magistrate had to move from place to place to see his witnesses. My information (from the men interviewed) is generally that the Magistrate conducted

WANGANUI REVELATIONS.

his investigations very fairly; that he was inclined to be "over firm," but resorted to none of the bullying tactics which so often make of court cases a burlesque. He neglected no opportunity of getting the fullest possible statement from the men concerned, but did not attempt to confuse any man in the making of his statement, although he exhausted every fair means to test the accuracy of any statement of which he was doubtful.

As will be seen, the Magistrate received his instructions on June 20. I have not been able to ascertain the date on which he commenced his investigations; but it would, of course, be soon after receiving his instructions. From the time the instructions were issued to the Magistrate to the date on which his report was signed and ready for presentation to the Minister, was exactly three months, a lapse of time which indicates the amount of care which must have been devoted to both investigation and report. But, although the Report was available, as the date shows, on September 21, 1918, it was not made public until December 5—two and a half months later, when it was laid on the table of the House as a result of a repeated effort on my part.

On October 23 I asked the Minister of Defence, without notice, "whether the report of the Magistrate's Court in connection with the alleged cruelties practised upon Conscientious Objectors at the Wanganui Detention Barracks had yet been presented, and, if so, whether the Report would be laid on the table of the House." Sir James Allen replied that "the report had not yet been before Cabinet. As soon as it had been considered by Cabinet it would be presented to the House."

About the middle of November I fell a victim to the influenza epidemic, then raging, and was away from the House for some time. On December 2, however, I left my bed and (unwisely enough) was in my place in the House for a couple of hours. During the afternoon I asked the Minister, again without notice, whether the Magisterial Report in connection with the allegations of cruelty inflicted on military prisoners in Wanganui was yet available; if not, when would the House be given an opportunity of dealing with it? Sir James Allen this time replied that "the report was at Defence headquarters, and he was sorry to say it had not come back to him. He would make inquiry about it, and get it brought down as soon as he could."

I was very ill at the time, and found it impossible to remain for the whole of the sitting. I suffered a slight relapse as a result of my going out too soon, and was compelled to lay up again, remaining in bed until the following Friday, when I again ventured out—this time to make a fight, along with Mr. Peter Fraser, M.P., against the Bill designed to disfranchise the C.O.'s.

On December 5, while I was away, the Magisterial Report was laid on the table of the House, and I was, therefore, deprived of the opportunity of discussing it on that occasion. However, when the

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

report was tabled, it almost completely substantiated the statements of the C.O.'s, and vindicated as well the attitude which had been taken up by those of us who sought to deputationise the Minister in the first place. It was, needless to say, a source of discomfiture for the Government. I have deemed it advisable to reproduce the report in its entirety in the chapter which follows.

XXV.—THE MAGISTERIAL REPORT.

Marton, 21st September, 1918.

To the Hon. Sir James Allen, K.C.B.G.,

Acting-Prime Minister and Minister of Defence for the Dominion of New Zealand.

Sir,—

[Re alleged ill-treatment of prisoners in the Wanganui Detention Barracks.]

In accordance with the request contained in a letter dated 20th June last from Major-General Sir Alfred Robin, K.C.M.G., that I should enquire into and report upon the above matter, I have the honour to report as follows:

With the object of having the scope of the enquiry clearly defined I interviewed the Adjutant-General—Colonel Tate—and the Director of Personal Services—Major Osburne-Lilly—in Wellington.

My attention was directed to a proof letter addressed to the Editor of the "Truth" newspaper from a number of military prisoners who had been confined in the Wanganui Detention Barracks, complaining of ill-treatment at the hands of the officer in charge, Lieutenant Crampton, and others of the staff, and it was suggested that I should take that letter as the basis of my enquiry, and investigate the charges there made and any cases of similar nature which might, during the course of the proceedings, come under my notice.

I was informed that I should have an entirely free hand, and that it was desired that the charges should be thoroughly investigated.

Particularly I was asked to ascertain:—(a) To what degree, if at all, the allegations in the letter to the Editor of "Truth" were correct. (b) If force had been used, for what purpose it had been used. (c) Whether it was lawful to use force for such purpose; and, further, I was asked to make such recommendations as I might think proper concerning the future conduct of the institution.

Instructions were given to Camp Commandants and other officers to allow me access to all camps and military institutions, and to permit me to see any soldier or other person whom I might desire to see; and throughout the enquiry every facility has been afforded me

THE MAGISTERIAL REPORT.

by the Department to ensure a fair and complete investigation on the matters in question.

I have seen all the prisoners whose names are appended to the "Truth" letter, with the exception of three, who are now on active service, and one—Fitzpatrick—who has escaped from custody, as well as every person whom any prisoner has desired me to see as being able to throw any light on the subject.

Having regard to the general nature of the enquiry, I decided to commence my interviewing the prisoners in order to get a general idea of the situation, and, having ascertained that, to be guided by what I should learn as to how I should proceed further. I came to the conclusion that I could best effect this object by seeing them in private wherever they might be, and going into the matter with them man to man, and I have continued this method with all concerned throughout the enquiry.

Shortly after deciding upon this method of enquiry, and while in Christchurch, I received a telegraphic communication from Mr. J. McCombs, M.P., asking that I should allow the prisoners to be represented by counsel, but, having decided upon the course that I intended to pursue, and, as the enquiry was a Departmental one in which I had no power to take evidence on oath, it did not appear to me that to do so would be either convenient or helpful, and I advised Mr. McCombs to that effect.

I then proceeded with the enquiry, and have seen and examined, and, in the majority of cases, have obtained written statements from prisoners, warders and others at the Paparoa Prison, Christchurch, the Alexandra Detention Barracks and elsewhere in Wellington, the Trentham Training Camp, and in Wanganui.

Having regard to the subject of the enquiry, I knew that I might expect to meet exaggeration on the one hand and prevarication on the other, and I approached it with this mind, checking the statements of one against that of another, and examining each person with reference to the statements of others. I have been able to discover little or no exaggeration in the statements of the prisoners. So far as I have been able to check them they are fair and truthful. There are, of course, discrepancies, but I found none that I can with certainty put down to dishonest motives; on the other hand, I am satisfied that many of the statements made to me by members of the Barracks staff were untrue.

I do not intend to set out in detail the evidence in support of any of my conclusions or the steps by which I arrive at them, except where it may be necessary to do so for the purpose of explaining or illustrating any particular matter. To do so would be to lengthen this report beyond reasonable limit. I attach hereto the evidence, which speaks for itself. I have omitted altogether reference to any matter that I regard as of only minor importance, or that I do not find to be substantiated.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

I first deal with the "Truth" letter.

This letter, though purporting to be signed by nine prisoners, was, in fact, not so signed; it was written either by or upon information supplied by Harry Wilson, he being one of the first of the prisoners to leave the Detention Barracks after the methods complained of in the letter began to be put into operation. As his sentence was expiring, it was arranged between the prisoners that he should take steps to give publicity to what was going on, and the letter was the result of this arrangement.

In the main the statements contained in the letter are true, and I obtained evidence of several other things that are not referred to in it. As the letter was written before Donovan underwent his punishment there is no reference to his case, nor to the cases of Fitzpatrick or McConville. There is, however, about the letter an exaggeration of style that tends to give a heightened impression as to some of the incidents narrated. Take, for instance, that part of the letter which deals with Beaton:

"The following day another objector arrived from Wellington, in charge of Sergt. Smith, of the Red Caps, the late coal dealer of Petone, Lieutenant Crampton's right-hand man. On refusing to do certain things against his principles he was forcibly dressed in denims, handcuffed, and then dragged round the yard by means of pull-through ropes around his neck, which nearly choked him. He was kicked and punched at the same time, and also pushed against the wall with sickening thuds, until his face on both sides was like a piece of raw steak, and drops of blood were to be seen all round the yard and also on the walls."

This suggests that Beaton was seriously wounded, or injured about the face, as a result of the treatment. As a matter of fact, he was seen by Dr. Anderson on the evening of the day on which he received his punishment. The doctor says there were several scratches on the side of his face, none of a serious nature, but such as could—and I am satisfied did—bleed profusely. The statement in the letter as to the appearance due to profuse bleeding may in a way be correct, but without the explanation furnished by the doctor's statement, it conveys much more than the truth. Later on I have set out in Beaton's own words his account of the affair.

It may be well to state here that, although none of the men were seriously injured, it is possible, for one who knows how, to inflict severe punishment without leaving many marks, and that is, I think, what happened in these cases.

Moynihan and Donovan—especially Donovan—are spoken of as determined Irishmen who had set themselves to defy the authorities by refusing to wear the uniform or to drill. These men were ordered two hours' pack drill. Neither of them stood it a full hour. Donovan is said to have been a man who, in resisting capture, had fought with two policemen, and Moynihan is described as something of a pugilist.

THE MAGISTERIAL REPORT.

I am satisfied that it would take something more than moral suasion to reduce Moynihan to subjection if he had made up his mind to resist. Yet he and Donovan, in less than an hour, were transformed from determined and defiant objectors to obedient and well-conducted prisoners.

The amount of force used in each case would, of course, depend, to a great extent, on the opposition shown.

Pallesen's case is one of opposite type from Moynihan's. Pallesen was a religious objector—I am satisfied a genuine one—who, terrified by threats and what he had heard from other prisoners as to the treatment meted out to objectors, decided while he was in Barracks, to offer no opposition to anything he was asked to do.

Each newcomer as he came in was warned by the other prisoners of what he might expect if he showed any opposition to wearing the uniform or drilling. Guard Byrne says he heard Moynihan saying to another prisoner: "It's not a bit of good for a man coming into the Barracks and saying he won't carry out the rules. I know it. They made me do it, and if they can make me do it they can make anyone do it." Byrne then adds: "What Moynihan said was perfectly true: when we made up our minds that we must do it we made them do it. If they had done it in the beginning there would have been no trouble." Byrne warned Donovan of what he had to expect and advised him to submit, giving me as his reason, "That he had had enough of it with Moynihan. Moynihan was a marvel of man to stand what he did."

Each prisoner who objected was plainly told by Lieut. Crampton that he intended to have discipline and obedience, and that so long as a prisoner was in the Barracks he would have to comply with the regulations, and that included wearing the uniform and drilling when required. If the prisoner would not agree to this he was threatened with the consequence of refusal, and if he still persisted he was broken in by main force. In Wilson's and Moynihan's cases bread and water and solitary confinement were tried first. Generally speaking, "breaking in" was accomplished in this way: A weighted pack was put on the prisoner's back, and a rifle fastened to his side by means of handcuffs and a piece of cord, one handcuff being attached to the stock of the rifle and the other to the prisoner's wrist; the barrel was tied by the cord to his shoulder. If he was wearing uniform, instead of being tied to the shoulder, the barrel was passed through the shoulder-strap. The prisoner was then ordered to march, and if he did not march he was pushed from behind and helped along by the arms round the yard. When he came to a corner he was pushed so as to bump against the wall, often so that he would strike it with his head; at times he was punched and thumped on the back and on the neck and his heels were trodden on. In some cases he was kicked. In Donovan's case, which I consider the worst, a rope was used by which to pull him around, water was thrown on him while

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

on the ground, and he was dragged for some distance along the floor of the yard. Beaton was also pulled round the yard by means of a cord, and he, Moynihan and Donovan were caught and pulled by the hair. From time to time the men would be stopped and asked if they would wear the uniform and do rifle drill, and if they refused or would not reply they were driven round the yard again until they were worn out and exhausted and gave in.

In all, leaving out Fitzgerald's case, which I have been unable to investigate fully, there were four cases in which prisoners were actually broken into submission. They were Wilson, Moynihan, Beaton and Donovan. The details of each of these cases appear in the statements of the prisoners concerned.

I propose to use Beaton's own words as giving a fair average of what happened. He was more severely treated than Wilson, but less so than Moynihan or Donovan. His statement of what occurred is accepted by Lieutenant Crampton as being a "fair outline of his career." He denies only that he ordered anyone to pull Beaton's hair, and says he could not tell who actually tied the rope on. I am satisfied however, that Beaton's hair was pulled, and that a rope was tied round his neck as he describes. He says:

"I am a conscientious objector. I arrived in the Wanganui Barracks on the 6th May on a sentence of 28 days for being absent without leave (not rolling up to medical examination). Sergt. Smith took me up from Wellington. On arrival at the Barracks I was taken before the O.C. to have my particulars taken. When it came to the question of what my religion was, I answered, 'I decline to state.' He then asked me my next-of-kin. I said I hadn't thought of it before, and it would take me a little time to consider. After taking the other particulars, he charged me with insolence. He asked me how I pleaded, and I said 'Not Guilty.' Sergt. Smith was there all the time. He then sentenced me to two hours' pack drill, and ordered me to be deprived of my mattress for two nights. I was taken to a cell, and told to take off my civil clothes by Sergt. Smith. I refused to take them off, and Sergt. Smith said, 'You are very foolish.' Parmenter came in, and he and Sergt. Smith took off my clothes, I not resisting. The O.C. came in also. They put me into the denims. I was not treated roughly. I was then taken into the office, I think, and a pack was put on. From there I was taken into the yard and a rifle was offered to me, which I declined to take. So it was handcuffed to my wrist—a pair of ordinary handcuffs, I think. Then I was ordered to march; I think there was only Parmenter, Smith, and the O.C. there then. I just stood still. Smith then tried to force me to march by pushing me behind. He pushed me a step or two. As I did not take it on the O.C. went in and came out with a rope. He fastened it round my neck. Then Smith took hold of it and commenced to pull me along, Parmenter pushing behind. I was pushed and pulled this way for several minutes. Every time I came to a corner, especially the

THE MAGISTERIAL REPORT.

corner near cell 3, I was bumped into it. The O.C. then ordered Smith to catch me by the hair. 'Get him by the hair,' or something like that. Smith grabbed me by the hair and kept hold of it until a handful came out. Then he got hold again, and some more came out. Then he left the hair alone and went on pulling the rope. When he had me by the hair he had a short grip of the rope. Hayes and Byrne then came on the scene. Byrne commenced to punch me on the back of the head and neck. This was kept up for several minutes. They were still running me around. Sometimes I fell to the ground. I was not kicked while on the ground, but I was kicked on the heels to quicken my pace. When I was on the ground the O.C. looked at his watch and said he was taking that time off. Occasionally I was stopped to right the pack, but I was kept going continuously. Smith was not on the rope all the time; sometimes someone else would take his place. Hayes was the one that did the kicking on the heels. It was not a serious affair—it was only to quicken the pace. After a time I took hold of the rifle and held it up. I found it better for myself to do that than let it hang by the handcuff. The O.C., after a while, asked me if I would put on the uniform. I said 'No,' and he said, 'Keep him going.' After a while he repeated the question and I answered, 'No,' and he said, 'At him again,' until I was bleeding from the face, where I had been pushed against the wall. (I could not lie on my right side for three weeks after.) They kept me going until I was fair done up. At the latter part the rope was choking me. After about three-quarters of an hour, I think, I was taken outside the front of the building to finish my hour. I think he thought he had dealt enough with me. From the time I took hold of the rifle I walked myself. The second hour I did the next day on a sentry beat.—I had given in to drilling. After I had done the first hour I was ordered and took a cold bath. I consider the treatment I got in the yard brutal. It is hard to explain it on paper—it doesn't look anything, but for an untrained man to go through it was very hard. He is more than a beaten man after a quarter of an hour. After I did what I was told there was no further trouble."

In addition to the four cases I have spoken of, I find the following matters proved:—

1. That on the occasion on which Wilson was forcibly dressed in his cell he was handcuffed, and while so handcuffed was knocked against the wall of his cell by Corporal Parmenter, so as to strike the wall with his head.

2. That Moynihan was forcibly dressed on three occasions on the Sunday on which he was dealt with in the yard—he having between time torn off the uniform or part of it. That these dressings resulted in a general melee or, as one of the guards describes it, "mix-up." That while these things were going on Moynihan no doubt received some knocks; that he had his head knelt on by one of the guards, and that he received a kick on the chest. I am of the opinion that

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

the kick or knock was one of the general results of the scuffle, and was not intentional.

3. That Badger and Pallesen were dressed in uniform against their wills, but that, as they offered no resistance, they received no rough treatment.

4. That Badger had a rifle handcuffed to his wrist and that he was kicked and punched by Sergt. Smith while being drilled in the staff yard as described in his statement.

5. That on the occasion spoken of in prisoner Carian's statement, and in the circumstances and in the manner described therein he was kicked by Guard Williams.

6. That Fitzpatrick was ill-treated in the yard by Lieut. Crampton and Sergt. Smith. I am unable—owing to Fitzpatrick not being available—to ascertain the full detail of the ill-treatment, and I am satisfied that as a result of what happened in the yard Fitzpatrick was bruised on the arm and was bleeding from the ear.

7. That the prisoners Badger and Pallesen were spoken to by Lieut. Crampton on the occasion of his taking their particulars in the office, and by others of the staff on other occasions, in the manner described in their statements, and that this treatment was in some way as hurtful to them as was physical ill-treatment to the other prisoners.

8. That McConville was assaulted by Lieut. Crampton in the yard while undergoing punishment drill. In the absence of Fitzpatrick, who was present at the time, I was unable to make a complete investigation of this case. Owing to my not being able to get Fitzpatrick's statement, and having regard to the denial of Lieut. Crampton and the statement of Hayes, I am unable to say whether McConville was actually struck by the rifle; but I am satisfied that Lieut. Crampton caught McConville by the throat, pushed his head against the wall, and at least threatened to strike him, and that the object of this assault was to frighten McConville into taking the uniform kit when it should be offered to him on his arrival at Trentham, and was not done for anything McConville was doing or had done or omitted to do in the yard.

From all the happenings it was quite clear that the object of the application of force was to compel prisoners who objected to do so to take the uniform and to do the rifle drill with the general purpose of breaking down opposition to Military Service.

As to whether it was lawful to adopt means of this kind to effect this object, it is scarcely necessary for me to say anything. If measures of this kind had been used in a Civil Prison to compel a prisoner to perform some task there is no doubt as to what would have been said to them. Turning to the rules for the conduct of Military Detention Barracks, I find that the only regulation dealing directly with the subject is Regulation 109, which says: "No member of the staff shall strike a soldier under sentence unless compelled to do so in self-defence, and in any case in which the application of force

THE MAGISTERIAL REPORT.

to a soldier is needed no more force than is necessary shall be used.' This regulation is practically identical in terms with Regulation 31 of the Regulations under "The Prisons Act, 1908," being the rules regulating the conduct of civil prisons.

It appears to me that under this regulation no more force may be used either in a civil prison or in a military detention barracks (as at present constituted) than is necessary to prevent a prisoner from harming himself, his fellow-prisoners, the prison staff or the prison property, or to convey him to or from some place to or from which he has been lawfully ordered to go, and it cannot be used to compel a prisoner serving sentence to perform some task or to do anything in the nature of a task that he has refused to do.

It was contended by Lieut Crampton that, according to the custom of the service, force similar in kind to that used by him was applied in all detention barracks, and evidence was adduced to me as to the practise in the Abbassia and Citadel Detention Barracks at Cairo and in some punishment compounds under Imperial rule in France. From this it appears that force more or less severe is used as punishment and to reduce refractory prisoners to submission. There was, however, no question of objection to military service with any of these prisoners. They were simply cases of defaulters, some of the riff-raff of the Army. Strong measures would have to be taken in such cases. But whether force of the kind spoken of was or was not used in those places is beside the question. Either the regulations under which they were conducted were different from those in force in New Zealand, or much of what is said to have been done there was as irregular as what was done in the present cases.

I am satisfied that Lieut. Crampton knew that what was being done would not, if called into question, have borne the light of day, but it is fair to him to say that his position was in some respects a difficult one. If he had only had the ordinary military prisoner to deal with I do not think, so far as he was concerned, that there would have been any trouble over the management of the prison. By the ordinary military prisoner I mean the man who, having no objection to military service, is doing a term of imprisonment for "absence from parade," "drunkenness on duty," or some such offence, and who, recognising himself as a soldier, is quite amenable to military discipline and looks upon his drill as part of his ordinary work.

But side by side with this class of men, Lieut. Crampton had to deal with two other classes of prisoners—one composed of men openly "up against and out to beat" military service, the other class composed of men whose religious scruples—though in many cases genuine—are beyond the understanding of the normally-constituted person. Neither of these would comply with the regulations, and the Lieutenant was thus faced with the question of the effect or the example of these men on the ordinary prisoner. Seeing them doing as they liked—a favourite practice with some of the more defiant of the objectors was

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

to show their defiance by refusing to address the officer as "Sir"—the ordinary prisoner would naturally see no reason why he should not behave in the same way.

Lieut. Crampton says that, before he took actual charge of the Barracks at Wanganui, knowing that he would have Conscientious Objectors to deal with, he had visited the Alexandra Barracks, Wellington, for the purpose of seeing in practice the methods applied there. He says he found discipline in those Barracks very bad, that Conscientious Objectors were under the control of a corporal and were allowed to do what they liked. He says that in answer to a question, the corporal replied, "What can I do? If I ask them to do something or wear any prison clothing they refuse. They whistle, sing, call out, and count out the military police, and do what they like."

He explained that in consequence of what he saw there he resolved to have a different state of things in the Barracks under his charge, and, if his description of matters at the Alexandra Barracks is correct, it was certainly time that a change was brought about there.

The defiant objectors gave him credit for being quite fair with them. He was determined that military discipline should be maintained in the Barracks, and he made this quite plain to them. As soon as one of them had given in and agreed to "carry on" there was nothing to complain of on the part of Lieut. Crampton. His attitude towards this stamp of man was: "Either I beat you or you beat me, and I'll take care you don't beat me." He took a short cut towards solving the problem before him, disregarding the fact that prison regulations are binding on all alike, and that, while they call for strict compliance on the part of the prisoners, they call with much greater force for compliance from those in whose charge prisoners are placed, and in whose hands they are to a very great extent helpless dependants.

Under the regulations, what appears to me to be ample power of punishment is given to officers in charge. Under Regulation 131 they may order close confinement, punishment diet, and deprivation of mattress for any period not exceeding three days. This power is far greater than that possessed by the jailer of a Civil Prison, and a prisoner committing a breach of regulations lays himself open to be dealt with by courtmartial, which may impose still greater punishment. Had Lieut. Crampton dealt with these prisoners throughout in accordance with this regulation, he would have been within his rights, but it is very open to question whether, as a matter of principle, it is right to deal with them at all in this way. It has to be remembered that these men were military objectors; that for refusing their kit, which really means refusing to perform any military duty, they had been sentenced to detention; to again offer them the kit or part of it or to require them to perform acts of a military nature while under detention and to further punish them for refusal is in effect to punish them twice for the same offence. If the courtmartial had power

THE MAGISTERIAL REPORT.

to order "bread and water" or to impose other conditions as part of the original sentence for refusing the kit, good and well; it could—if it wished—have done so. But if such a court had not that power, or if it had refrained from exercising it, it is not proper for the punishment awarded by the courtmartial for a particular offence to be increased by other means because of a repetition of that offence during the period covered by the original term.

I think the practice of sending objectors for a short term to Detention Barracks is absurd. It tends to destroy the discipline of the ordinary military offender and seems to me to serve no useful purpose. I think such men should be treated from the beginning in the way that it is proposed to deal with them ultimately.

It is not within my province to discuss the general question of the treatment of such men. Ranging as they do from the shameless coward and the open rebel to the man who, whatever may be thought of the soundness of his principles, is sincere and is prepared to sacrifice everything for them, it is difficult to devise a means of treatment applicable to all cases.

During the course of my investigations I have had many conversations with Objectors and others, and in consequence have formed some opinion on the subject, and if required I shall be glad to place it before the Department.

I submit the following recommendations as to the future conduct of the institution:—

(1) That the Barracks be used as a place of detention for military offenders only, and that objectors to military service should not be sent there.

(2) That the personnel of the staff be changed. So far as I can ascertain, none of the present staff possesses any experience or particular qualification fitting him for this kind of work. Some are clearly quite unfit to act as prison warders. I suggest that the new staff be composed of specially-chosen men, none under the rank of a non-commissioned officer.

(3) That, in addition to the military official visitors provided for by Regulation 41, the Minister should appoint suitable persons, being civilians, with duties and powers similar to those of a visiting justice of a civil prison, and that all members of the Prisons Board, the Inspector and Deputy-Inspector of Prisons and the Stipendiary Magistrate of the district be so appointed *ex officio*.

I have the honour to be, etc.,

(Signed) J. GEORGE L. HEWITT.

XXVI.—AFTER THE VERDICT.

The long-delayed report, with its verdict of guilty, and the Magistrate's declaration that the officials at the Detention Barracks had lied to him, while the statements of the prisoners were substantially true, was like a bombshell dropped among the National Government supporters; but only the Labour members were ready to force the Government's hands in the matter.

On December 6, Mr. L. M. Isitt (Christchurch North) asked the Minister of Defence, without notice, "whether any punishment had been allotted, and, if so, what punishment it was, on the men who were responsible for the cruelties practised on the military defaulters in the Wanganui Detention Barracks." Sir James Allen said "the report of the Commission recommended the removal of the staff. The staff had all been removed except the lieutenant in command, and he would have been removed but for the outbreak of influenza, which had rendered it difficult to at once replace him." Mr. Isitt asked "if that meant that the men responsible had been dismissed or merely removed to another position?" Sir James Allen: "The staff has been removed."

On the same day, also without notice, I sought information from the Minister as to "whether the House would be afforded an opportunity to discuss the Wanganui Report, and, if so, when? Also, whether he would lay on the table all the papers in connection with the term of office of Lieutenant Crampton?" Sir James Allen replied that "anything that was not of a confidential character in connection with the officer referred to—and he did not know that there was anything confidential—he would be glad to lay upon the table. In respect to a discussion upon the report of the inquiry referred to, he might say that the honourable member had an opportunity of discussing that report at any time he liked; but he could not see that there was any object in wasting the time of the House over a discussion upon the report now."

On December 9, Mr. Witty (Riccarton) asked the Minister of Defence, "if it was correct that one Smith, formerly Lieutenant Crampton's right-hand man at the Wanganui Detention Barracks, was at present a sergeant in the military police at Christchurch; and, if so, was that the removal the Minister spoke of?" Sir James Allen replied that "he could not tell the honourable gentleman, but would make enquiries. At present he did not know."

The papers in connection with Crampton's Samoan record were not laid on the table of the House, and when it appeared that all discussion was likely to be burked, I took advantage of the third reading of the Appropriation Bill to raise a protest. My remarks are reported in "Hansard" thus:—

"I wish to refer to the case of Lieutenant Crampton, a man who was formerly Provost-Marshal, Commissioner of Police, and Judge of

AFTER THE VERDICT.

Native Affairs at Samoa. He became involved in trouble with a native women there. He was courtmartialled three times. He escaped on the more serious immoral charge, but was found guilty of having assaulted a woman. It was proved that he had thrashed her with a stick. For that crime he was merely reprimanded, and his return to New Zealand was recommended. He came back to New Zealand, and for some reason best known to themselves, the Defence Department placed him in control of the Wanganui Barracks, and gave him charge of the Conscientious Objectors and other military defaulters, and we have had laid on the table of the House the report of the Magistrate, Mr. Hewitt, showing that Lieutenant Crampton, while in charge at Wanganui, was guilty of almost indescribable brutalities, so far as the prisoners under him were concerned. I want to ask for an assurance that this man will not be retained as a military officer, that men will not be placed under his charge, and that he will not be allowed to exercise the powers over them which he exercised over the prisoners at Wanganui. I want to go further than that, and demand from the Government that Lieutenant Crampton shall be placed on trial for the crimes of which he was guilty at the Wanganui Barracks. I think the House ought to insist on the fullest explanation by the Government as to why, knowing Lieutenant Crampton's record, knowing the serious charge on which he had been tried at Samoa, knowing that he had been found guilty of brutally ill-treating a half-caste woman—why, knowing all this, he was still allowed to retain his position as an officer in the Defence Forces, and why he was given that important position at Wanganui. I have made in this House and outside it repeated attempts to get at the bottom of this case, and to get Lieutenant Crampton's record as regards Samoa, but, for some unaccountable reason, delays occurred that were irritating, and which seemed to those of us outside the inner circle, to be altogether inexplicable. The Christchurch 'Sun' has given the public the information which I have given to this House, and I think the position is a most serious one. . . . I ask from the Cabinet an explanation with regard to Crampton, and an assurance that he will not be allowed to remain a day longer in the Defence Forces of New Zealand."

XXVII.—THE COURT-MARTIAL.

The "trial" of J. W. Crampton, lieutenant, on charges of having ill-treated prisoners at Wanganui Military Detention Barracks was commenced at the Drill Hall, Wanganui, on Wednesday, January 29.

The court consisted of Lieut.-Col. Colquhoun (president), Major Hume, Major Macksey, Major Henty, Major Asworth, Major Talbot, and Captain Smith.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Captain Hudson was prosecutor, and Captain Baldwin judge-advocate.

Prior to the date of the courtmartial I had communicated with the Minister of Defence urging that the men who had been subjected to the treatment complained of should be permitted to be represented by counsel—a request which the Minister refused.

The prisoner was represented by Mr. N. G. Armstrong, of Wanganui—who appeared as junior counsel to Mr. Loughnan (Palmerston North).

The drawing of the class line received some emphasis when Crampton, under guard, came into court, and immediately sat down without waiting for the court's permission. The Army Act provides that a common soldier must not sit unless the court allows him to do so, but an officer has the right to sit without the court's permission.

I made an application to be permitted to assist the prosecutor, quoting from the Manual of Military Law, section 42, footnote c, as follows:—"If the prosecution is instituted at the instance of a civilian, that civilian may be in court and assist the prosecutor, but he cannot speak or take part himself in the prosecution, except as a witness, as (subject as to the rule as to counsel) the prosecutor must under this rule be in every case subject to military law, though, of course, this requirement does not extend to counsel appearing for the prosecution." I pointed out that no one would seriously dispute that I was the instigator of the present proceedings. The first charge that men had been ill-treated at Wanganui Detention Barracks had been made by myself at Reefton on May of last year; and since that time, both in the press, on the public platform, and from the floor of the House, I had repeatedly demanded a trial. The present proceedings, I insisted, arose out of my demands, and were, therefore, instituted at my instance.

Mr. Armstrong objected to the application being granted. He contended that the instigator should be something more than the writer of letters to the Minister and newspaper articles, or the making of speeches either on the platform or in Parliament. He should have special qualifications to assist the prosecutor, and he denied that Mr. Holland had those qualifications. The Judge-Advocate interjected that the word was not "instigated" but "instituted"—which was a different matter. Mr. Armstrong proceeded to say that the real institutor of the proceedings was Crampton himself.

Captain Hudson, prosecutor, pointed out that the question was rather one of "conferring" and not so much "assisting." He did not think that he could be assisted very much by Mr. Holland, but had no objection whatever to the application being granted. It was the prosecutor's duty to ascertain the truth, and he would welcome any assistance in that direction.

The Judge-Advocate strongly opposed the application. He argued

THE COURTMARTIAL.

that it would have been necessary for Mr. Holland to have legally instituted the proceedings to entitle him to the privilege conferred by the clause he had quoted. Mr. Holland did not come within the scope of the word "instituted." It applied only where a civilian could give material assistance to the prosecutor.

The president, after conferring with the other members, said that the court was compelled to take its law from the judge-advocate, and must, therefore, rule that Mr. Holland's application could not be granted.

An application by Mr. Armstrong for an adjournment of the proceedings was successful, the Court deciding to adjourn till February 12.

No Crown witnesses had been brought to Wanganui for the trial, which seemed to indicate that the adjournment had been arranged previously.

An incident in connection with Mr. Tom Moynihan reveals that the Defence Department is so utterly mismanaged that it cannot even locate the men in its employ. Mr. Moynihan was employed as a member of the Medical Corps at King George's Hospital, Rotorua. A day or two prior to the courtmartial the authorities were seeking his address in order to call him as a witness. The Wellington office apparently communicated with the Greymouth office, asking for the address, and the Greymouth office applied to Mr. Moynihan's father at Otira for the necessary information.

The second sitting of the Court took place on February 12. There were in all eleven charges against Crampton. The first was that he had ill-treated Harry Wilson (a Conscientious Objector) by grabbing him by the neck and allowing two non-commissioned officers to place a military pack on his shoulders.

Wilson described how Crampton became annoyed because he refused to "sir" him, and also because he told him (Crampton) that he was not "Private" Wilson, but Mr. Wilson. Crampton sentenced him to three days' bread and water; his own clothes were stripped from him and he was forcibly dressed in uniform. He then described his treatment by the guards, concluding with the statement that when he refused to obey Crampton's order to put on the pack, Crampton caught him by the hair with both hands and pulled his head almost to the ground.

While Mr. Wilson was in the box, he was asked by Mr. Loughnan (counsel for Crampton): "Did the letter sent to 'Truth' wind up with these words: 'This is signed by eight Conscientious Objectors'?" The answer was "I don't think so." (A reference to Mr. Wilson's letter to Mr. Mark Fagan— of which the "Truth" letter was largely a copy— shows that Mr. Wilson gave the names of the eight men by whom he had been authorised to sign.)

Captain Hudson sought to ask the witness if he had ever been induced by Crampton to attach his signature to any document; but

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

counsel for Crampton strongly objected, and the Court upheld the objection.

Quartermaster-Sergt. Porter said Smith brought Wilson into his office, where the pack was kept. Wilson was knocked about until he put it on. Crampton then caught Wilson by the hair and shook his head. He then ordered Wilson's hair to be cut off, and this was eventually done. Crampton caught Wilson by the neck and pushed his head down. Crampton and Sergt. Smith were yelling and bawling continuously at the man. It was mostly bad language they were using.

Cross-examined by Mr. Loughnan, witness said he was quite positive Crampton seized Wilson by the neck and pushed him to the ground. Great violence was used. He could see no reason for the violence. Wilson was shook as if he were a dog.

Crampton's evidence was to the effect that he was not handling Conscientious Objectors, but soldiers. "He received verbal instructions from headquarters that no Conscientious Objectors would be sent to Wanganui Barracks." He claimed he had the right to use what force was necessary when a soldier obstinately refused to do his duty. Wilson "showed dumb insolence." He admitted giving Wilson three days' solitary confinement on bread and water, and ordering him to be deprived of his mattress. He denied that he had seized Wilson by the hair, and also gave an absolute denial to Porter's evidence. When a communication came from headquarters giving the names of eight men whom it was alleged had signed the "Truth" letter, he "made" inquiries, and the men "voluntarily signed a document denying cruelty or that they signed a letter to 'Truth.'" Two of them, he said, declared that all they did was to sign a blank paper.

On the third day of the Court's sitting, Crampton's counsel (Mr. Loughnan) made an astonishing revelation as to the purpose of the courtmartial. Crampton, he said, "WAS NOT BROUGHT THERE TO ANSWER CHARGES LEVELLED AGAINST HIM, BUT IN ORDER TO CLEAR HIS CHARACTER OF CHARGES MADE THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY BY A TOTALLY IRRESPONSIBLE TRIBUNAL, APPOINTED UNDER GOODNESS KNOWS WHAT AUTHORITY."

The Court's decision was reserved.

The second charge against Crampton was that he allowed unnecessary force to be used to compel Harry Wilson to do pack drill.

During Wilson's evidence, objection was raised to the term "slaughter yard," applied by Lieut. Crampton (according to the evidence) to the yard in which drill took place. Wilson described how he was pushed and punched by Lance-Corporal Walker, with Crampton giving orders, while they were endeavouring to make him do pack drill. He had refused to obey the double quick march because it was

THE COURTMARTIAL.

a military order. He was firmly resolved not to obey any military orders.

Quartermaster-Sergt. Porter said Wilson was driven round the yard with a pack on, and with Smith and another man on either side holding an arm, and Crampton chasing round giving orders. Crampton's orders were: "Keep him going." There was a little blood flying around. Wilson was knocked about in a way no sensible man would treat a dog. He (witness) had told Crampton he was breaking the regulations. Crampton was in the habit of blackguarding him (witness) in the office.

When the courtmartial resumed on the fourth day the Judge-Advocate argued that "the law permitted force to be used for the maintenance of military discipline." He combatted the argument of Capt. Hudson, the prosecutor, that "any force was unnecessary because under no circumstances could force be used to a soldier except in accordance with the commands of a competent tribunal." The Judge-Advocate then proceeded to "stress the importance of maintaining and enforcing discipline." If the force used by Crampton was used to maintain military discipline, he contended, no offence had been committed.

The Court reserved its decision.

The third charge against Crampton was the treatment of William Bertram Donovan, who served 25 days' detention at Wanganui.

In the course of his evidence, Donovan said that on his arrival at the Barracks, Crampton asked if he would carry a rifle and wear a uniform. He replied that he would not—that he objected to military service. Crampton said: "I don't recognise military objectors here," and added: "Take him to the slaughter yard." After a pack had been put on him, and he refused to march, Corporal Jenkins put a rope round his neck, and started to pull him round the yard. Occasionally Smith and Parmenter pushed behind. When he fell, buckets of water were dashed into his face while he was lying on the ground. After about three quarters of an hour of this treatment, he said he was done and consented to march. Crampton said: "You have just lasted three quarters of an hour which is five minutes less than the man who lasted longest." He (witness) was again told to march, and he did. While he was marching Guard Williams was kicking him from behind and Parmenter on several occasions punched him on the back of the neck. Smith also pulled witness by the hair and nose. Accused (Crampton) hit him under the chin with a cane and told him to hold his head up. The blow was hard enough to break the skin and make it bleed. Crampton also hit him on the hand and told him to swing his arms. His hand was all swollen across the knuckles and he was also cut under the chin. Lance-Corporal Faulkner on several occasions pushed him into the wall. At the present time he was

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

serving a term of a year and eleven months' imprisonment for refusing to take his kit at Featherston. He was a Conscientious Objector and a Roman Catholic.

Thomas Moynihan, who was at the Wanganui Detention Barracks during May of 1918, deposed that as he was on his way to his own cell he saw Donovan in the "slaughter yard" with a rope around his neck, and immediately after heard bumping and scuffling in the yard, followed by groans and the sound of dragging.

Donald Kerr Porter, son of Colonel Porter, and who was Quartermaster-Sergeant at the time, said he saw Donovan being ill-treated. He was thrown on the ground and bumped against the wall. Witness thought he was dead. He saw Crampton telling Donovan to get up, and Jenkins pulling on the rope round Donovan's neck and dragging him along a few yards. He (witness) then left. He expected to hear next day that Donovan was dead.

Crampton admitted that he "put his hand under Donovan's chin to make him hold his head up," but denied that he struck him. Donovan had a slight scratch on his cheek which witness attributed to careless handling of the rifle.

J. M. M. Jenkins, corporal, said "the only time Crampton touched Donovan was to correct the position of the rifle."

Dr. Anderson, medical officer attached to the Barracks, said he examined Donovan, but found no marks on his neck.

Thomas William Smith, formerly a sergeant at Wanganui Barracks, gave evidence in support of the defence. He admitted that water was flung over Donovan, but said if Crampton struck him under the chin with a cane he did not see it.

The Court's decision was reserved.

The fourth charge against Crampton was taken on the fifth day of the "trial," when he was charged with permitting unnecessary force to be used to compel Donovan to obey an order.

Donovan and Moynihan gave evidence on similar lines to that tendered by them on the previous day.

Alister Beaton said that while undergoing 28 days' detention, he heard scuffling in the yard and a loud groan. He was on his way from the bathroom to his cell, and looking into the yard saw Donovan in a limp condition. The next morning he saw red marks on Donovan's neck and scratches on both sides of his face.

At this stage the prosecution asked for leave to put in as evidence the depositions of Private Joseph McConville before Mr. J. G. L. Hewitt, S.M., at the magisterial inquiry, the witness now being overseas. Counsel for accused objected, and the Court ruled the evidence was not admissible.

Benjamin Winch, a member of the Military Police at the Barracks, made reference to the treatment of Fitzpatrick, and said he knew that Donovan had been knocked about.

THE COURTMARTIAL.

Crampton, in the course of his evidence, said "he had been advised by the civil police that Donovan was a dangerous character." A rifle had been handcuffed to Donovan's wrist "as witness wanted to make sure he could not use it on the staff." He admitted that three buckets of water were poured over Donovan.

Under cross-examination by Captain Hudson, Crampton said: "If he had allowed a man to beat him, it would have meant the end of his career at the barracks. There was no difference in the treatment of a dangerous character, but witness would be more on his guard.

Arthur George Faulkner, lance-corporal, admitted that he had helped to pull Donovan along, but said it was untrue that Donovan was pulled around by the hair or nose. "Donovan tried to bite Sergeant Smith, and on that occasion Smith caught Donovan by the nose and pushed his head up."

On the sixth day, Major Osborne Lilly, Director of Personal Services, was a witness. He described a visit made by him to the Wanganui Barracks and his interviews with the men whose names were attached to the "Truth" letter. Replying to one of the men, he said he "formed the impression that Pallesen was not as sound in his mind as might be expected from a normal individual." He spoke to all the men except Wilson and Moynihan.

In reply to Captain Hudson, the Major admitted that he had not carried out his investigations in "a proper legal manner." Had he done so, he said, the persons against whom accusations were made should have been present. "It was not a secret investigation."

John Malcolm Morris Jenkins said he saw no ill-treatment of Donovan; and Sergt.-Major Bell described the methods employed at the Adessia Detention Barracks in Egypt, under Imperial control. At the time of his visit in February of last year, there were 200 soldiers in prison there, and they had some bad cases. All the men were told what would happen if they refused to obey orders. No refusal was allowed; force would be applied if a man refused to carry out orders. "He had seen it used on more than one occasion; it happened fairly frequently." If a man refused to put his uniform on he was taken in a room away from everyone else and given the option of putting on the uniform himself or having it put on by the staff. If he still refused he was forcibly dressed. If the man struggled, more force would have to be used to overcome his resistance, and sometimes he would get knocked about for his own fault. Witness had seen force used on several occasions to make a man march. The man was generally seized by each arm and marched along. If he refused to march then he would be frequently dragged by the feet. He would be kept on the move by relays of staff until he decided to march. Another method was to place him either two or three in a four when the parade was in columns of fours and give the order to quick march. He had either to march or be walked over. The method was generally effec-

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

tive. A rope was sometimes placed around the man's waist and he was pulled round till he was willing to march. Ill-treatment and foul-play were absolutely forbidden in the barracks, such as punching a man or causing him any bodily injury. There were safeguards against the abuse of force. The barracks were frequently inspected, and at such times the men under detention had an option of complaining, and if the soldier could prove that the staff had used unnecessary force to make him obey orders, the staff would get very short shrift. Witness remembered a man refusing to shave before going on parade. He was taken to his cell and forcibly shaved. These methods were generally successful in breaking down resistance and making men submissive. The treatment at this barracks was very much more lenient than at the Citadel, which was another detention barracks. The Adessia was known as "The Nursery."

This witness, under cross-examination, insisted that the Superintendent of the Detention Barracks was the judge of the amount of force to be used. "On what would he base his judgment?" asked Captain Hudson. "On the amount of resistance used by the soldier," replied the sergeant-major. "Would he not be guided by rules of Military Detention Barracks?" was the next question. "No," was the reply: "he would not think of them; it would be a case of man against man."

Counsel for Crampton argued that the force used "was merely sufficient to overcome the resistance."

Captain Hudson, in closing his case, remarked that accused and others had frankly admitted that a rifle was strapped to Donovan, a rope put around him, and water thrown over him when prostrate. According to the rules, Donovan should have been reported to the officer commanding to be dealt with under the Army Act. It was clear that unnecessary force had been used. There was nothing in the regulations to show that a man could be handcuffed to an object, fixed or otherwise. The use of a rope was not authorised in any way, and was a force that was unnecessary. No one was allowed to strike a soldier, unless in self defence.

The Judge-Advocate justified the use of water, and described Donovan's account of his treatment as "wild."

The Court reserved its decision.

The fifth charge against Crampton was that of striking John McConville, a soldier.

Captain Hudson asked leave to withdraw the charge, owing to McConville, the principal and only witness, being overseas, and the Court having already ruled that his evidence was not admissible.

The Judge-Advocate objected to the withdrawal of the case. He argued that if the evidence for the prosecution were insufficient, the Court could acquit Crampton.

The Court retired to consider the point, and on its return did not announce its decision.

THE COURTMARTIAL.

The sixth charge against Crampton was that he permitted unnecessary force to be used to compel McConville to do pack drill.

Owing to McConville having been embarked, his evidence was not available, and the Court reserved its decision.

The seventh charge against Crampton was that he allowed unnecessary force to be used to compel Thomas Moynihan to do pack drill. The case was called immediately prior to the Court's adjournment on the sixth day.

On the seventh day of the "trial," Moynihan entered the witness-box, and told the Court that while in the barracks, on 1st May, he was sentenced to pack drill. A uniform was given to him; he refused to put it on, and it was forcibly put on. He was considerably knocked about. Lieut. Crampton was not present. At his request, witness was taken before Lieut. Crampton, and complained that he had been kicked over the heart. Witness showed him the marks. Lieut. Crampton asked Corporal Jenkins what it was for, and he replied that witness had refused to put on his uniform. "Oh, if that is so, we will soon —— fix you up," Crampton said. Witness was taken back to the cell, where the uniform was again forcibly put on him. Witness was ordered to pack drill after church. The pack was put on him forcibly, and witness was ordered to march. Corporal Parmenter bumped his head on the wall, and he was punched on the back. Lieut. Crampton was present then. Witness was ordered to march, but did not. He was punched around the yard for a few turns and bumped into the wall. Parmenter, Jenkins, Faulkner and Byrne used to take turns about, and punched him round the yard for a considerable time. Then they had a confab as what to do next. Lieut. Crampton came in and out of the yard and asked if witness would give in. Faulkner grabbed witness by the hair and pulled him along the yard. Witness struck him. Then they all got on to him and knocked him about. Faulkner kicked him while he was on the ground. Lieut. Crampton came into the yard then and made some remarks to witness which had the effect of stopping him from groaning. He then ordered the guards to carry on with witness. He said: "Push his head through the b—— wall." The guards did their best to do it.

Someone suggested taking a photograph, which Lieut. Crampton adopted, and took photographs. Lieut. Crampton asked if witness would carry on, saying, "I'll beat you, Moynihan, I'm a pig-headed Irishman like you are." Witness asked to be given one guard at a time, and he would not care. His rifle was tied on to his left arm with a string, and kept coming off his shoulder. Faulkner bumped it against his face, and kept doing it until blood ran down his face. Jenkins told Faulkner to cut it out as it was spoiling the uniform. They kept at witness for an hour, and after that he was ordered inside. Witness then told them he would give in.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

In reply to Mr. Loughnan, witness said he was very violently kicked on many occasions, first in the cell, and then afterwards in the yard. He was kicked over the head, on the small of the back, and on the legs. After witness struck Faulkner, the latter used to be allowed to get at him, and then knocked him down, and struck him with his boots. The rifle was tied on to his shoulder with a piece of string, which went round his neck. Witness was exceedingly sore after this experience, and was for weeks afterwards. He was black and blue on the back. He stood to be photographed. Somebody kicked his feet into position, and Faulkner held the rifle while he was being photographed. It was before he was photographed that Faulkner struck him with the rifle barrel. He was examined by a doctor at the barracks some time after the occurrence. It was not the next day; it was just before he came away. It might have been the 5th when it took place. He would deny that he was examined on the 6th. He would contradict Lieut. Crampton if he said in witness's presence that he told the doctors that witness had complained that he had been kicked over the heart the previous day. The doctor did not examine him at any time as to the injury to the heart he had complained of. After he came out of the padded cell, where he had been for 48 hours on bread and water, witness was too weak to carry on, and the doctor examined him. This was before the pack drill. Witness denied that the barrel of the rifle was put through the shoulder strap and tied to his wrist at the commencement of the drill and remained in that position throughout the drill.

Roland Gordon Halkett, who was undergoing detention at the barracks, said he heard scuffling and struggling in the yard, and accused asking Moynihan if he would do any drill. Witness heard bashing and bumping against the wall, and Crampton say: "Give him some more," and "Keep him going." Shortly afterwards witness heard groans coming from the yard, and accused's voice telling Moynihan to get up. Witness saw Moynihan two days after with the marks on his face.

Quartermaster-Sergt. Porter said that Moynihan, while doing pack drill, was punched by Parmenter and kicked by Faulkner.

Dr. Anderson said Moynihan complained of an injury to his chest about the heart, and witness could find no trace of it.

Accused Crampton said Moynihan was given pack drill for refusing to put on uniform. As he refused to march witness ordered the guards to take turns in pushing him round the yard. Moynihan finally agreed to do his drill. When Moynihan came to the barracks first he declared he would only fight for Ireland, and he (Crampton) accordingly regarded him as "a defiant shirker."

Arthur George Faulkner denied that he kicked Moynihan or grabbed him by the hair. John M. M. Jenkins and Edward Byrne denied that Moynihan was either hit or kicked. The latter witness, however, said he was not present all the time.

THE COURT-MARTIAL.

The eighth charge against Crampton was heard on the ninth day of the "trial." Crampton was charged with having permitted the staff to use unnecessary force to compel Allster Beaton to do pack drill.

Alister Beaton said Crampton ordered him pack drill for two hours, also to be deprived of his mattress for two days on a charge of "insolence." He was forcibly dressed in denims, and taken to the yard, where he declined to take the rifle handed to him. It was handcuffed to his wrist. He was ordered to march, and refused. Crampton put a rope round his neck, and he was dragged round the yard by Sergt. Smith, Corporal Parmenter pushing behind. Witness was continually being humped into a corner of the wall, and he started to bleed freely from the face. At Crampton's orders Smith got witness by the hair and dragged him round the yard, a handful of hair coming out. Smith caught hold again and another handful came out. After a time witness consented to hold the rifle. While he was marching round, Private Haines trod on his heels to quicken his step. During one of the rounds, Private Byrne came in and rained punches on his back and neck for some little time. After witness had consented to march, Crampton asked if he would put the uniform on, and on receiving a refusal, ordered him to go round again. During one of the rounds, Crampton poked him in the ribs with his cane. On one of the last rounds, witness fell to the ground; he got up as quickly as he could, cannoned into the back wall and then hit the other wall, the blow nearly knocking him out. Crampton then called a halt and ordered a uniform to be put on him. After a little more marching, Crampton asked him if he had any complaint to make. He at first did not answer, but eventually said he had none. Some time later Crampton asked the men at tea if any who had obeyed orders had been ill-treated. No one replied. He then asked if any who had disobeyed orders had been ill-treated. Witness told him he had got a pretty rough handling. He replied: "My God, you did! And you will get it again." The night of the pack drill witness was examined by a doctor, who asked how he got the abrasions on the face. Crampton answered for witness, and said it was an omission on witness's part that day.

Cross-examined by Mr. Loughnan, witness said Byrne was the only man who struck him. As a result of the blows, the back of his head and neck were sore and stiff. He did not show this condition to the doctor. The doctor was making a mistake in saying the scratch on his face was slight. It was so bad that two days later scabs formed and prevented him shaving. Witness said he told the Magistrate that he considered the treatment that he got in the yard was brutal. It did not look very much on paper, but for an untrained man to go through it was very bad. He was quite sure the rope was put round his neck, but it was not tight.

Harry Wilson said he was working when he saw Beaton being pulled around by a rope.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

The Court reminded witness that in his statement to the Magistrate he said that Beaton was being "dragged," and demanded to know why he now said "pulled."

Witness replied that he used the words "pulled" and "dragged" in the same sense. In his cell he heard shouts and orders coming from the yard, and sickening thuds coming from the wall. He heard Crampton say: "Push his head through the wall," and "I would rather bury you than let you win." He also heard Crampton say: "Oh, Beaton, the sight of blood does my eyes good." This lasted about twenty minutes. Afterwards witness saw blood on the walls of the building in the yard where Beaton had been, also splashes of blood all round the yard. Witness saw Beaton at tea time, and his face was badly knocked about—his cheeks reminded him of pieces of raw steak.

R. G. Halkett said he was working in the kitchen when he heard orders and scuffling coming from the yard. He subsequently saw Beaton pass the kitchen door, and noticed that his face was bleeding. Two days later he noticed marks on Beaton's face.

Thomas Moynihan stated that he saw Beaton in the yard with the rope round his neck and being pulled along. This was while witness was passing on the way to his cell. He subsequently heard scuffling in the yard. He saw Beaton after he came out of the yard; there was blood on his face and the skin was off. He saw hair in the yard next morning and blood on the wall. The hair was Beaton's, and there was a handful of it.

Quartermaster-Sergt. Porter said he saw Beaton with the pack on on two or three occasions. On the first occasion witness saw Beaton punched and knocked against the fence by Smith and Parmenter. After his pack drill, Beaton and several others were not examined for several days, perhaps for a week.

Crampton said Beaton's attitude on admission was one of "defiance and insolence." He admitted that the rifle was tied to Beaton's shoulder and lashed round his body with rope. It was also handcuffed to his wrist. "He proved most obstinate, and it took two men practically the whole time to push and pull him round." For fifteen minutes Beaton put up a big fight against the force used. The discipline maintained in the Barracks was everything that could be desired. He denied saying that "the sight of blood did his eyes good." He denied that he gave Smith any order to seize Beaton by the hair, nor did he see him being dragged about the yard by the hair of the head. He did not think it extraordinary that Beaton's nose began to bleed.

Edward Byrne (one of the staff engaged when Beaton was doing pack drill) denied that he struck Beaton at any time, or that Smith dragged Beaton by the hair. Beaton "offered a violent resistance in the yard."

Sergeant Smith said that Beaton "did not fight at all," but would

THE COURTMARTIAL.

not march. He did not hear Crampton use the expressions alleged by Beaton, nor did he seize Beaton by the hair and drag him along. The rope was used not for pulling him round the yard, but for pulling him to his feet.

After hearing addresses from prosecutor and counsel, the Court reserved its decision.

The ninth charge against Crampton was that on May 5, 1918, he permitted unnecessary force to compel William Smith Badger to do pack drill.

W. S. Badger said he came to the Barracks at the end of May. He was ordered drill the day after he arrived. Sergt. Smith handcuffed the rifle to his wrist, and then pushed witness from him with a punch. Crampton came into the yard, and when Smith told him witness would not carry on, he ordered his cane to be brought from the office. After Crampton came into the yard Smith rushed at witness with his teeth bared. Previous to this Smith had kicked him, but he did not know whether Crampton was then present. Smith turned witness round, pushed him, and continued to punch him round the yard. Crampton came alongside and used very bad language to witness, and tapped him under the wrist with his cane, telling him to keep him hand up.

Cross-examined by Mr. Loughnan, witness said he had been kicked and punched by Smith before he was certain Crampton had come into the yard.

Mr. Loughnan was proceeding to read portions of the statement witness had made before the Magistrate, when witness asked for the whole of his evidence to be read, and was told peremptorily by the Court: "Your duty before this Court is to answer questions." Whereupon the witness strongly protested against this procedure. It was only fair, he urged, that the whole of his evidence should be read. "Don't argue," commanded the Court; "answer the questions put to you." Witness firmly denied that he complained to Crampton about Smith kicking and assaulting him.

Frederick Pallesen said he was being drilled in the yard with Badger, when the latter put his rifle down and refused to carry on. "Sergt. Smith then came in, carrying a rope, and he walked up to Badger and kicked him." Witness was immediately ordered out of the yard.

Crampton, in his evidence, alleged that Badger had complained to him that Smith had kicked him. When witness asked Smith about it he denied the charge, but admitted that "he had caught Badger by the shoulders, put his knee behind him, and straightened him up and gave him a push ahead." He (witness) "could positively swear that Badger was not kicked or punched by Sergt. Smith."

The tenth charge against Crampton was that he permitted the staff to use unnecessary violence to compel F. Pallesen to do pack drill. He pleaded not guilty.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Captain Hudson asked for a ruling on the point whether the force referred to must be physical force.

The Court ruled that the force used must be physical force, and the case broke down on the technicality.

The eleventh charge against Crampton, heard on the tenth day of the "trial," was that he permitted unnecessary force to be used by the staff to compel George Carian to obey orders.

George Carian said the morning after his arrival he was ordered by Corporal Williams to have a bath, and, after bathing, was kicked and also punched on the back of his neck by the corporal as he moved along the passage on his way to his cell.

Eugene Hurlihy said that on the night when Carian came in he took a fit in his cell, and witness heard Crampton tell Carian that if he took any of his fits there he would get his guts kicked out. Smith was in the cell also, and told him if he wanted to die he would lend him a razor, and if he didn't have enough guts to cut his throat, he would lend him a gun, and he could shoot himself. Witness said he saw no force used on Carian while Crampton was present.

Dr. Anderson deposed that he saw Carian occasionally during his stay in the Barracks, and he complained only of palpitation of the heart and generally out of sorts.

Crampton denied the statement made by Hurlihy. No such language was ever used to Carian. Carian had never laid a complaint, although every man under detention knew of the proper procedure. Witness knew nothing of the occurrence at all. Carian was certainly punished for inattention on parade; he was given an hour's pack drill, which witness considered sufficient. Carian, according to a statement from the A.A.G., Palmerston North, was a confirmed soap-eater and malingerer.

The Court found Crampton not guilty of the whole eleven charges, and "honourably acquitted" him.

Immediately after the courtmartial, Crampton was given the position of Area Officer, Group 20, Wanganui. The whole of the prisoners left the Wanganui Barracks on January 6, the building was handed back to the civil authorities on February 10, and Crampton (who remained behind to clear up various matters) relinquished command on March 25, receiving the appointment mentioned above. A further reference to the case will be found among the Appendices.

On September 2, I placed the following notice of motion on the Parliamentary Order Paper: "That there be laid on the table of the House all the papers in connection with Lieut. Crampton's term of office at Samoa, including the full report of, and evidence in, his trial by courtmartial at Samoa." At the date of publication, I am still awaiting the opportunity to move it.

XXVIII.—ENTHRONING PRUSSIANISM

On December 5, the Expeditionary Forces Amendment Bill was brought down "by message from His Excellency the Governor-General." The legislative fiction of the "first reading" was gone through. Then, immediately, the Minister of Defence moved the second reading, briefly explaining the several clauses.

The Bill sought to "extend by six months the period of enlistment of members of the Expeditionary Force." This was the language in which the Minister described the proposal. What it really meant was the extension of Conscript Service for an additional six months to the term prescribed in the principal Act. The Minister became angry when, during the debate on the third reading, I put it this way. His reason for proposing the change, he said, was that the troops could not be demobilised in the time provided in the principal Act. The clause (2) which covered this proposal and clauses 3 and 4 appeared to me to be designed to tighten the military bonds. Clause 5 had to do with military hospitals, and clause 6 was purely a washing-up clause, to give effect to the section of the principal Act which provided for the abolition of the Expeditionary Force Reserve after the termination of the war. Clause 7 was the best clause in the Bill. It provided for the payment of bonuses to soldiers, but still it was made clear that this was not to be given as a right, but was to be regarded as a "free gift," which might be withheld or deferred or subjected to terms and conditions at the Minister's will.

Clause 8 enacted that: (1) The Minister of Defence, as soon as practicable after the passing of this Act, shall cause to be prepared and published in the Gazette a list, to be called the Military Defaulters' List, in which shall be set out, so far as ascertainable, the names, occupations, and abodes of all men who since the commencement of the present war with Germany and before the passing of this Act— (a) Have been convicted by courtmartial of any offence of such a nature as to indicate, in the opinion of the Minister, an intent permanently to evade or refuse to fulfil their obligations of military service in the present war; or (b) having been called up for service with the New Zealand Expeditionary Force under the Military Service Act, 1916, have deserted from that force or have otherwise made default in the performance of the obligations imposed on them by or in pursuance of that Act in such manner as to indicate, in the opinion of the Minister, an intent permanently to evade or refuse to fulfil their obligations of military service in the present war; or (c) having been members of the Expeditionary Force Reserve constituted by the Military Service Act, 1916, have illegally evaded enrolment in that Reserve in such circumstances as to indicate, in the opinion of the Minister, an intent permanently to evade military service in the present war.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Under clause 9, Religious Objectors (i.e., Objectors who were members of churches which declared military service to be contrary to divine revelation) were exempted from the Military Defaulters' List. Clause 10 provided for the amendment of the list "by deleting the names of men inserted therein in error, by adding thereto the names of men who have been omitted therefrom in error, and by correcting or supplying any error or defect in the name or description of any military defaulter," with the proviso that "the entry of any name in the Military Defaulters' List shall not be invalidated by any error in the name or description of the military defaulter so referred to." By clause 11 it was provided that "any man whose name has been entered in the Military Defaulters' List within the time and in the manner prescribed by regulations under this Act may appeal to a Stipendiary Magistrate on the ground that he has been entered in the list in error, and the magistrate shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such appeal, and if the appeal is allowed the name of the appellant shall be removed from the list."

Clause 12 prohibited the return to New Zealand of military defaulters who were not in New Zealand at the time of the passing of the Act for 10 years after it was passed, rendering them liable, so often as they returned within that period, to arrest with warrant, to twelve months' imprisonment on summary conviction, and to deportation on the expiry of the sentence.

Clause 13 provided that—(1) All military defaulters are hereby deprived of civil rights for a period of 10 years from the passing of this Act. (2) Every man so deprived of civil rights shall be incapable—(a) Of being appointed or of continuing to hold any office or employment in the service of the Crown or of any local or other public authority; (b) of being elected or appointed or of continuing to hold office as a member of either House of Parliament or as a member of any local or other public authority; (c) of being enrolled as an elector or voting at any election of a member or members of either House of Parliament or of a member or members of any local or other public authority.

Clause 14 constituted any exercise or attempted exercise of civil rights by a military defaulter an offence rendering him liable to 12 months' imprisonment; and under a similar penalty clause 15 prohibits any change of name by military defaulters.

The discussion on the second reading of this vicious measure was brief indeed, only the Minister and Sir John Findlay speaking on the motion. No adequate opportunity was allowed members to make themselves acquainted with the main features of the Bill. It is a sound contention that no measure involving great changes should be carried through its second reading until the full text of it has been at least 14 days before the people, so that the electors may have the opportunity of objecting to its provisions if they desire, and also in order that the members of Parliament may know what they are asked to

ENTHRONING PRUSSIANISM.

vote upon. This Bill was rushed through its three readings in two days, notwithstanding that its enactment involved the ruthless destruction of a principle held dear in British law for long years: the principle that a man should not be punished twice for the same offence. The members of the National Government had endeavoured to excuse their jailing of Conscientious Objectors two and three times over for the offence of refusing to be a soldier by speciously pronouncing that every time a man was given an order to take a kit and failed to obey a new offence was constituted. This plea won a hearing from a few people; but the new law was designed to add an extra punishment which could not be explained away by any process of plausibility. The man who had already served three sentences was now to be further punished by having his franchise taken away from him and by being deprived, so far as the Government had the power to deprive him, of the right to earn bread and butter for his children. Worse still, it was to be retrospective in its application—a retrospective punishment that was to hit the helpless child, the innocent wife, harder even than it could hit the husband and father who had refused to be a soldier. It was a law that was aimed at the opponents of the Government which framed it. It was read by some for an effort on the part of the Government to save itself from the votes of the victims of its own wretched wrong-doing. Again, not only was it a retrospective law, but it was a retrospective law made after the war had ended and when there could be no suggestion that such a law was needed for the purpose of assisting to improve the war situation.

When the House went into committee there was again little discussion on the various clauses. The Labour Party was suffering seriously as a result of the influenza epidemic. Mr. Hindmarsh had died; Mr. Walker was ill; Mr. Fraser had not wholly recovered from his attack; and I was in bed, not yet recovered from my relapse.

Clause 12 apparently did not prove stringent enough to suit a majority of the members. In its original form (as proposed by the Minister) it read: "If any military defaulter is not in New Zealand at the passing of this Act, it shall not be lawful for him at any time within ten years after the passing of this Act to return to New Zealand, and if and as often as he does so he may be arrested by any constable without warrant, and shall be liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for any term not exceeding 12 months." Illogical, illegal, and vicious as the proposal was in this form, it was still not considered drastic enough, and Mr. Statham (Dunedin Central) secured the insertion of the words "or remains in New Zealand" after the words "as often as he does so."

Mr. McCombs sought to add a new clause which, if carried, would have prevented the additional punishment contemplated by the Act from being inflicted upon men who had already endured legal punishment for refusing military service. Mr. McCombs's proposed new

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

clause read: "Notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, the name of any man who has before the passing of this Act been convicted by courtmartial of any offence of the nature indicated in paragraph (a) of section 8 of this Act shall, after the expiry of the sentence of imprisonment or detention imposed on him for that offence, be omitted from the Military Defaulters' List, and notice of such removal shall be published in the Gazette." This sensible amendment was emphatically negated on the voices.

Late at night on December 5 I received a telephone message from Mr. Fraser to the effect that the Expeditionary Forces Amendment Bill had been that day rushed through its first and second reading stages, was almost through the committee stage, and that the third reading would be taken next day. Mr. Fraser explained the anti-Labour nature of the Bill; and I resolved that I would get to the House next day in time for the third reading. We agreed that a fight against the Bill should be made along the lines of the Labour Party's declared policy.

Mr. Fraser had not fully recovered from his illness, and I was a very sick man when we met in the Chamber on the 6th. It was on this day that Mr. McCombs's amendment was defeated in committee. It was, in fact, the last item in committee, all the Bill's clauses having been disposed of on the previous day. Immediately following the rejection of Mr. McCombs's clause, the third reading of the Bill was proceeded with. The Government was forcing the already indecent pace of its rush legislation to permit Mr. Massey and Sir Joseph Ward to leave for the Peace Conference—which, in any case, they were not morally entitled to attend as representatives of the people of New Zealand. Every public interest in the matter of legislation was being ruthlessly sacrificed to facilitate that quite unnecessary trip—the whole harmfulness of which in its results we have yet to learn.

Had it not been for the Labour Party, the third reading would have gone through without discussion. We found there were times when, the Government whips having cracked, the Government supporters—Tory and Liberal alike—were prepared to function dumbly. This was one such time apparently. But our attack produced the miracle. The dumb spake.

It was 10 p.m. when Mr. Fraser rose (in accordance with our arrangement) to oppose the third reading. His speech was unimpassioned, unanswerably logical, and deeply convincing. But Reason found no abiding place in the Chamber on this occasion. Mr. Fraser declared that it was a well-known principle in jurisprudence that retrospective laws were bad, and pointed out that such laws were beyond the power of Congress in the United States. The Bill before the House was not only retrospective, but provided for punishing men who had already been punished. He appealed for the widest possible tolerance, and also for an effort on the part of honourable members to understand a point of view foreign and antagonistic to their own. He

ENTHRONING PRUSSIANISM.

quoted from utterances of Professor Gilbert Murray, the Earl of Selborne, and Lord Parmoor in support of tolerance, and mentioned that men like Lord Hugh Cecil, Lord Henry Bentinck, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Lord Kitchener had favoured reasonable consideration of the claims of Conscientious Objectors. He twitted the Liberals in the Cabinet with having abandoned their Liberalism, and declared that the House had no right to pass this legislation. He questioned, indeed, if it had the right to pass any legislation at all. Parliament, having extended its own life, was not representative of the people, and the Government was exercising its power to disfranchise a section of the people who might reasonably be expected to vote against it. Therefore, the Government's policy was to disfranchise its political opponents. If, some day in the future, a Labour Government, following the precedent created by the National Government, should set out to disfranchise the property-holders, would any one in the House say a word in defence of that action? Yet this was exactly what the National Government was now doing—disfranchising its opponents. The war was over and finished, and so far from serving any useful purpose this Act would only drive certain men (who could be used not in any military capacity but in a social capacity in many directions) into the position of permanent outlaws in the community. The most useful legislation that could be passed to cement the harmony and goodwill of the people would be to follow the example of South Africa and bring in a Bill of indemnity and oblivion. The number affected by this revengeful and vindictive penal legislation was comparatively small. By no stretch of the imagination could their punishment be of any use to the State, but by persisting in this sort of legislation the members of the Government were providing that while they professedly set out to defeat Prussianism in Europe, they were enthroning it in New Zealand.

While Mr. Fraser was speaking, irritation and discomfiture were written very plainly on the faces of the extreme militarists, and it was natural to expect that the more uncontrollable among them would be on their feet when the member for Wellington Central had finished speaking. But discipline overcame desire, and no one arose. I was, therefore, compelled to follow my colleague. (I do not propose outlining my speech here. It will be found in Hansard's pages.)

Then the storm broke loose. Even in Parliament men are to be found who mistake hysterical declamation for effective reply, fierce invective and frothy verbiage for argument, windy shriekings and torrential outpourings for proof of patriotism. All these manifestations were in evidence on December 6. Round about midnight the three speeches in reply to Mr. Fraser and myself were made. Rarely have Parliamentary speeches achieved a lower standard. One was a frenzied diatribe—just that and nothing more; and some one has said that frenzied diatribes are ever the rotten-ripe fruit of attenuated mentalities. All of the speeches rang like the bellicose pro-

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

duct of militaristic minds inflamed with age. In none of the speeches was there an absence of misrepresentation. In at least two of them there were regrettable and discreditable slanderings of honourable and courageous men. It was made to pass for a clinching argument that "if a man would not fight for his country he should not be accorded citizen rights in that country." But the fact was ignored that the very men who were speaking had refused to let the people decide whether any man should be required to go out of the country to fight in a war that he was not permitted to have any voice in entering, as was also the fact that they reserved to the leaders of their party alone the right to decide whether when a man went to war he was really "fighting for his country." Not only so, but they ignored as well the case of the men who not only did not fight for "their country," but as profiteers took advantage of the war conditions to actually plunder the wives and children of the soldiers who were doing the fighting for them.

There was no measure of difference in the intolerance displayed by the Tories and the Liberals. An incident which revealed the state of the Liberal mind occurred while Mr. Fraser was speaking. He had made reference to the Quakers who, during the time of the Commonwealth and Charles II., had been sentenced again and again to imprisonment because they thought it an act of idolatry to take off their hats in court, and the Hon. T. M. Wilford interjected: "Do you state that the men who are in jail are of that class?" Mr. Fraser replied: "I know that some of them are." Mr. Wilford then asked: "Would you like me to read what they have written?" (It should be mentioned that Mr. Wilford was then Minister of Justice, and by reason of his Ministerial office in a position to know the contents of private letters written to their friends by the prisoners.) Mr. Fraser retorted severely: "If the Minister is capable of so dishonourable an action as taking private letters and reading them publicly." "But," he added, while the Minister nursed his chagrin, "some of those men are men of intellectual and scholastic attainments higher than any member of this House." "Bosh!" said the Minister of Justice, inelegantly. "It is not bosh," replied Mr. Fraser; "and the Minister who is interrupting shows that he has not taken the trouble——" Then Mr. Wilford, beaten back to his last line of defence, went off at a wild tangent and irrelevantly asked: "Are you loyal?"

Now, it happened that a day previously I had received a letter from Mr. Webb, in which he informed me that 21 C.O.'s in Kaingaroa had addressed a letter to Mr. Wilford, offering to go out and act as attendants and helpers in connection with the fight against the influenza epidemic. The only condition the C.O.'s laid down was that the time so occupied should not be counted off their sentences. When I suggested to Mr. Wilford that he might read to the House this letter he admitted having received it, but added that he had also received a similar letter from the long-sentence men.

ENTHRONING PRUSSIANISM.

When the Minister of Defence, in making his reply at the close of the debate, referred to the offer of the C.O.'s to help to fight the influenza epidemic, the Liberal Minister of Mines found himself capable of making the spitefully mean interjection: "It would have been a worse epidemic." And the Reform Minister of Defence was capable of agreeing. "Yes," he said; "it would have been a worse epidemic." I have no doubt that both gentlemen, as soon as they were able to think calmly, deeply regretted the incomparable unfairness of their remarks (all the more so because the suggestion was quite as untruthful as it was unfair).

When eventually the House divided on the third reading of the Bill, the voting was 54 to 2—the two being Mr. Fraser and myself. Mr. Walker was ill at the time, and Mr. McCombs had left for home some time before the division—which took place well on towards 1 a.m. I may mention that our determination to divide the House was made for the purpose of securing a record of the members ready to inflict on this country the wickedness of such a measure as that designed by Mr. Massey and Sir Joseph Ward and their colleagues in the National Government. The division list as it appears in Hansard reads:—

AYES: Allen, Anderson, Anstey, Bollard, Buddo, Carroll, Craigie, J. M. Dickson, J. S. Dickson, Ell, T. A. H. Field, W. H. Field, Forbes, Sir W. Fraser, Guthrie, Harris, Henare, Hornsby, Hudson, Hunter, Jennings, Lee, Luke, McCallum, MacDonald, Malcolm, Mander, Massey, Myers, E. Newman, Ngata, Nosworthy, Parr, Pearce, Pomare, Poole, Reed, T. W. Rhodes, Russell, Scott, Sidey, S. G. Smith, Statham, Sykes, Stewart, Talbot, Veitch, Wilford, Wilkinson, Witty, Wright, Young.

NOES: P. Fraser, Holland.

Enemies of the Labour movement have endeavoured to make capital out of the allegation that in opposing the third reading of the Bill the Labour Party opposed bonuses to soldiers, etc. This, of course, is not true. The Labour Party has consistently fought for better conditions for the soldiers, whether on service or returned. But it is an old trick of the political adversaries of Labour to attempt to make things look awkward for Labour members by sandwiching something that meets with popular approval between the vile clauses of what is generally speaking a bad measure. It was a tactic that was not unknown to Bismarck in the worst days of Prussianism. The Labour members were obliged in this particular instance to vote against the Bill both by reason of its attack upon the vital principles of Liberty for which Labour stands, and also because our conference decisions imposed on us the obligation to fight against any intensification of militarism. From the viewpoint of the Labour movement, there was nothing that could have been put into the Bill to make it good enough for any well-informed Labour Party or any honest Labour man to lend support to

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

while its major clauses challenged Magna Charta itself, provided for the strangling of Liberty and the destruction of the prerogatives of the people; while the Bill as a whole proposed to add tyrannical punishments to punishments already inflicted, to take away from upright, clean-living, pure-minded men of Religious and Socialist principle the right to work for the State and the right to vote—a disability not imposed on the vilest criminal. If the murderer escapes the gallows, when he has paid the penalty the law demanded, his civil rights are restored to him; the child-ravisher, notwithstanding his awful crime, has his right to work and vote restored to him; likewise the burglar, the embezzler, the pickpocket, the common thief. But the class-consciousness of the ultra-militarists of the National Government could not tolerate the extension to the highest type of Christian or the loftiest-minded idealist among the working men and the intellectuals the privileges of citizenship they readily restored to the proved criminal. The harm that accrues to Society when the ruling class imposes such a condition is incalculable. Morality is in its decadence.

XXIX.—THE PROBLEM OF THE CONSCIENCE

Whoever with open mind shall read the story of the Conscience men of New Zealand all too imperfectly written into these pages will surely need no argument against the further intense militarisation of the Dominion. Whoever without prejudice shall read the record of the atrocities inflicted on these New Zealanders by other New Zealanders will not need to be convinced that, while it required great courage to face the lightning flame that leaped from the wild storm of war, great courage to brave the hail of death that swept across the battlefield, it called for even greater courage to enter that fiery furnace of barbaric torture which Mark Briggs, Archibald Baxter, Garth Ballantyne, and their comrades passed through. It is of such men and their courage that the eminent Professor James Ward has written: "The value of a single man or woman of open mind, independent judgment, and moral courage, who refuses to be cajoled, is only concerned to be right, and not afraid to be singular, deferring to reason but not to rank, true to their own self, and, therefore, not false to any man—the value of such a man or woman, I say, is priceless; a nation of such men would leaven and regenerate the world."

The Conscientious Objectors were in conflict with the law of New Zealand—a law made, it is true, without the consent of the people, but still a law, with all the organised force of the political class State behind it. When that bad law was first promulgated I predicted in the leading columns of "The Worker," that Labour would mark down for political extinction every politician guilty of the crime of

THE PROBLEM OF THE CONSCIENCE.

Prussianising New Zealand. Under that wicked enactment the Conscientious Objectors became, in the generally accepted sense of the term, law-breakers. They knew their position; they knew the price they would be required to pay if they persisted in giving pride of place to the dictates of conscience. Cheerfully they were prepared to pay it. When the moment came to decide, as once it comes "to every man and nation," they never hesitated. Hatred, scoffing, and abuse they chose "rather than shrink in silence from the truth they needs must think." Bitterly they were made to pay for their choice. The intolerance that dominates the ruling class mind—slumming over the lessons of history, superficially regarding the psychic realities, often seeking to instal science as the handmaiden of stagnation—found wide and ungenerous, often angry and uninformed, expression in every circle where the problem of the Conscientious Objector became the subject of discussion. Bishop Sprott, of Wellington, wandered into a maze of discursive illogicalities which seemed to represent a surrender of some of the foundation principles of Christianity. Militarists, professing Christians and declared Materialists, raved. The Chief Justice of New Zealand found himself unable to resist the temptation to join in the contumelious chorus. On a previous occasion I was constrained to direct public attention to the Chief Justice's excursions into the realms of controversial politics, and then insisted that while the law which prevents public servants from taking the political platform remains, its provisions must apply to the Chief Justice equally with the latest police probationer. In the course of a recent address I had occasion to say: "We have a right to expect that whoever occupies the highest judicial position shall maintain a judicial viewpoint, and shall at no time and under no circumstances permit himself to indulge in ill-advised attacks—framed in the language of extravagance—against any section of the people, whose servant he is held to be, and on all of whom falls the burden of providing his not illiberal salary. If the Chief Justice becomes unmindful of the duty he owes to his position; if he strips off his judicial robes and assumes the attitude of politician and partisan, then he must not complain if the Labor movement places duty before every other consideration and offers the fullest criticism."

In July of last year, apparently as chairman of the Prisons Board, Sir Robert Stout visited Kaingaroa Prison, and on his return he delivered a lecture which was largely of a political nature, and the spirit of which would not have been calculated to inspire the average Conscientious Objector with a very great measure of confidence in the impartiality of the Court. The Wellington correspondent of a South Island paper wrote of this address: "There is a type of Conscientious Objector which even jail inmates spurn. This was mentioned by Sir Robert Stout, Chief Justice, in an address on the prisoners at Kaingaroa Prison Camp. He said there are several prisoners held for breaches of the Defence Act and military regula-

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

tions. Public conscience is evidently becoming awakened even amongst the law-breakers, for some prisoners who were confined for ordinary crimes refused to speak to military prisoners, saying they would not work with them, as they were a disgrace to the Dominion in shirking their responsibilities under our military law."

From this report I was able to gather that Sir Robert Stout gave credit to the Quakers who were Conscientious Objectors, and his antipathy seems to have been directed against the Socialist, Irish, Religious, and other Objectors whose objections rested on other than the extremely narrow "religious" foundations provided for in the Military Service Act. It is extremely regrettable that the Chief Justice should have found it possible to think, and still more regrettable that he should have given expression to the thought, that because the sexual criminal, the embezzler, the thief, or the professional burglar, declared they would neither speak to nor work with honest, clean-living men, whose only offence was the possession of a conscience which forbade the taking of life, the fact betokened the awakening of a public conscience amongst the criminal class. It may have meant something altogether different. It may have amounted to not more than what some unhappy criminal conceived to be the most effective method of convincing a patriotically credulous chairman that the time had arrived when the Prisons Board might safely favour his release. Even if it meant all the Chief Justice thought, it was surely most improper for the chairman of the Prisons Board to diffuse from the public platform sentiments calculated to create ill-feeling between the prisoners themselves. I have thus far assumed the Chief Justice's statement to be a wholly correct statement of fact—that the professional criminals did really refuse to work with or speak to the C.O.'s. But it is only fair to add that I have interviewed various Conscientious Objectors released from the several prisons (including Kaingaroa), and in no instance have I been able to find substantiation of the statement. I do not say that it cannot be substantiated. I merely say that the released C.O.'s I have interviewed knew of no instance where professional criminals refused to work with them. On the contrary, the professionals were generally eager to work in association, but it was not the policy of the Department to permit such associated work.

In another paper I find the following included in a report of the same lecture: "We must have what is termed a State or a public conscience," said Sir Robert Stout. "We have heard much of late of private consciences. It is well to have a conscience of some kind; it is well to be guided by moral considerations; but if a man or a woman sets his or her conscience above the dictates of the public conscience, it does not bespeak an exalted moral attitude."

The Chief Justice—as a Rationalist of many years' standing, as a front-rank Freethinker—must know that a State conscience is something which can have no existence. Even if it were admitted that a

THE PROBLEM OF THE CONSCIENCE.

State conscience could exist, that conscience could only find active expression at the ballot-box. In Australia, where the opportunity was given, the "public conscience" declared Conscription to be wrong. In this country a handful of men refused to permit the "public conscience" to express itself, and set their minority conscience over the dictates of the "public conscience"—which explains, I suppose, why we "cannot boast an exalted moral attitude." So that the C.O.'s are not really in conflict with the public conscience, but with the conscience of a minority who were able to manipulate the governmental machinery in a way which prevented the "public conscience" from functioning. I might digress at this point to remark that if Sir Robert Stout really understood the historic development of the State his utterances would be differently framed.

Whether we accept Christian, semi-scientific, or scientific definitions of conscience, Sir Robert Stout's depreciation of the "private conscience" will be found to rest on no foundation whatever. From almost time immemorial, the Churches have taught that "Conscience is the Voice of God." We have been told from the cradle to the grave that if our conscience tells us a thing is wrong, it is wrong—that the still small voice that speaks the warning is the voice of God's own righteousness. The religious writers who have sought to reconcile science with religion have proclaimed similarly. "And this is conscience, the voice of the law of God within us, which speaks far more strongly than the outer voice of the praise and blame of others," says Arabella B. Buckley, in "Moral Teachings of Science." "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," is the way it is put in the Book of Proverbs. "Conscience," says Lord Avebury, "is a safe guide." Browning calls it "The great beacon-light God sets in all." Byron says something similar:

"Whatever creed be taught or land be trod,
Man's conscience is the voice of God."

John Stuart Mill, in his essay, "On Liberty," demands freedom of conscience without restriction: "This then is the appropriate region of human liberty. It comprises first the inward domain of consciousness; demanding liberty of conscience in the most comprehensive sense; liberty of thought and feeling; absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment on all subjects, practical or speculative, scientific, moral, or theological. . . . No society in which these liberties are not, on the whole, respected, is free, whatever its form of Government, and none is completely free in which they do not exist absolute and unqualified."

And again: "No one can be a great thinker who does not recognise that as a thinker it is his first duty to follow his intellect to whatever conclusions it may lead. Truth gains more by the errors of one who, with due study and preparation, thinks for himself, than

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

by the true opinions of those who only hold them because they do not suffer themselves to think."

Sir George Greenwood, M.P., in "The Problem of the Will," issued by Watts and Co., furnishes a Rationalist definition: "Conscience is merely what one thinks in a particular case on a question of right and wrong with reference to the proposed course of action. It is one's judgment on a question of practical ethics. . . . He who acts against the voice of conscience does wrong because he does what he thinks to be wrong. To say that a man should always follow the dictates of his conscience is no more than saying that he should always do what he thinks to be right. Conscience, therefore, is always a safe moral guide to the individual, though it may make him do things which the majority of mankind think foolish or ill-advised, or even criminal."

Finally, in his "Riddle of the Universe," the great German materialist, Professor Ernst Haeckel, to whose school of thought Sir Robert Stout may be said to belong, puts it this way: "We now know that each act of the will is as fatally determined by the organisation of the individual, and as dependent on the momentary condition of his environment, as every other psychic activity."

From every viewpoint Sir Robert Stout was wrong. From every viewpoint—whether religious, semi-scientific, or scientific—the Conscientious Objectors were right. They were right because they were following the promptings of their own conscience. And now that the hurricane of Hate no longer rages with its war-time fury, it may be noted that the soldiers who heard the artillery roar along the line of battle, the brave men who with a laugh on their lips looked Death in the face, have no words of scorn for the bona fide Conscientious Objectors. The soldiers from the depths of their own souls' courage, are able to pay sincere tribute to other brave men who saw differently from themselves, and who, seeing differently, were called upon to "stand alone" through terrible hours which strained every mental and physical power of endurance. Not the men who fought, and fought gallantly, were they who hurled contumely at the men of conscience; that Hymn of Hate was reserved to be sung by men—mostly old men—who never fought either Kruger or Kaiser except with goosequills and fountain pens, from long thousands of miles behind the guns.

The war is now "ended," and other wars are either threatening or progressing. The Prussian Militarists failed to win, but Prussian Militarism raises triumphantly and detestably its head in every land—insolently, aggressively, threateningly. The falsehood that the world slaughter was a "war to end war" stands brazenly naked before the bereaved peoples. Thunderclouds of revolution are rolling up the sky, "whirlwinds of rebellion" are shaking the planet. In the background the fathers and brothers, the mothers and wives, the sisters and sweethearts, and the orphaned little children, are sorrowing dry-

THE PROBLEM OF THE CONSCIENCE.

eyed or flooding the earth with their tears. The countries are counting their dead, their limbless, sightless, and insane men—compiling their records of human wreckage and ruin. The soldiers who fought for Freedom stand aghast to behold her in shackles. The Democracy they bled for they see imperilled by the stranglehold of Privilege. The millions who mourn their millions of dead are learning in heartbreak and bitterness that in the world war, as in all wars, the people have suffered defeat. But where all other facts are blurred and seen as through a glass darkly, one fact hurls its rays of light through the murkiness like a star of the first magnitude. The greater victory—the real victory—of the war years was won by the Conscientious Objectors of all countries. The Labour Movement acclaims their courage and honesty. The Labor Movement denounces their persecutors, protests against the vindictive action of an unrepresentative Parliament which awarded an additional punishment of deprivation of civil rights on top of a multiplicity of other and barbarous punishments. The Labor Movement demands the immediate restoration of every civil right to the Conscientious Objectors, and pledges itself to work unceasingly for such restoration. For these men with their high sense of personal responsibility as Citizens of the World may be reckoned among the nation's best assets. Imperishably they have written their names on history's scroll of heroes. Professor Ward is right: "A nation of such men would leaven and regenerate the world." With the record of the shocking treatment they endured and the fortitude with which they faced worse than death, none in future days will dare to open lying lips to stigmatise them as cowards and shirkers. There would be no dictionarial term that would adequately describe the slanderer who would ascribe cowardice to such men. They have vindicated the prophetic faith of the poet:

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes in pain
And dies among her worshippers."

THE END.

APPENDICES.

Appendices I. and II. are reproduced from Australian papers for the purpose of showing that the statements of the New Zealand Conscientious Objectors regarding the barbarities inflicted upon themselves have not been exaggerated. The exposure made by Mr. Corboys, M.P., and the statement of Private Sutton (both of Australia) make it clear that military rule is no respecter of persons. The common soldier, whether he hailed from New Zealand, Australia, or Britain, was not always exempted from the atrocious treatment meted out to the C.O.

APPENDIX I.

Mr. Corboys, an Australian Member of Parliament, who went to the war as a volunteer, made the following statement in public after his return from active service:—

"A man crimed for a trivial offence was awaiting punishment. He was ill. We had to make a long march from one part of the line to another. He paraded ill before the doctor. The colonel of the battalion, who was not a doctor, said that the man was malingering. They got a rope and tied him behind a limber. They told him to march, and he could not march; and they dragged him for miles behind that horse limber, along cobblestone roads. He was cut and bleeding and half dead. The colonel and the adjutant rode back to him, and asked: 'Will you march now?' He said: 'I cannot march; I am too ill.' They said: 'We'll break your spirit; we'll make you.' They took him up and lashed him breast high with the rope up against the back of the cart, and dragged him along in that manner. That is Prussianism for you, and it happened in an Australian battalion. It was my own battalion, and my own colonel and adjutant were the guilty officers."

APPENDIX II.

The following appeared in the "Australian Worker" of August 28, 1919, over the signature of "No. 3861, Private P. H. Sutton, 46th Battalion, A.I.F.":

In January, 1917, I was doing a sentence of fourteen days' field punishment (No. 2) in company with two others. This punishment consists of being confined to the guard room and parading under the supervision of a provost sergeant. We were ordered to parade with

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

the company, fully equipped for drill purposes. Considering this to be a contravention of the King's Regulations, we refused to carry out the order. We appeared before Colonel Lewis, of the 47th Battalion, and were given the option of six weeks' imprisonment or being tried by courtmartial. Two of my mates, one of whom has since been promoted lieutenant, accepted the punishment, whilst I requested a courtmartial, believing myself to be in the right.

On January 28 I was tried and sentenced to two years' hard labour. I paraded four times to Colonel Lewis and begged to be allowed to do the sentence in the front line, where I would have a chance of distinguishing myself and receiving a pardon. However, this was refused, and I was sent to Abboncourt Military Prison, France. The brutality and humiliation suffered caused myself and several other Australians to endeavour to escape on April 9. I was recaptured and brought back to the prison, placed in a cell by myself, and most brutally treated. I was placed in figure-eight handcuffs, and one military policeman struck me on the mouth with his clenched fist, breaking four of my teeth. Another policeman also punched me in the face. I fought back as well as possible, but had no chance, and was knocked unconscious. When I recovered, I was given a bucket of water to wash the blood off, and was taken to the Governor, who awarded me the limit punishment—15 days' P.D. No. 1, bread and water twice daily, and 42 days' P.D. No. 2, which means bread and water twice daily, and a pint of porridge in addition, also 28 days' crucifixion. The day after the sentence I was sent to No. 2 Military Prison, Rouen, and immediately placed in leg-irons and hessian trousers.

Imagine the humiliation of a man who had left his country with the highest ideals, who was innocent of any grave offence, being placed in the position of a dangerous criminal. You people at home, whilst reading of our victories and feats of arms on the field, could not have thought it possible that some of your own countrymen, perhaps even your own flesh and blood, were being tortured in the military prisons of France and England. I HAVE SEEN MEN DIE FROM THE SCANDALOUS TREATMENT THEY RECEIVED, AND I CAN ALSO GIVE THE NAMES OF TWO MEN WHO PURPOSELY DESTROYED THEIR OWN EYESIGHT TO ESCAPE THE HORRIBLE TORTURE, WHICH WAS DRIVING THEM INSANE.

I will give a few authentic cases of which I was an eye-witness in the Rouen No. 2 M.P. In the month of August, 1917, 35 Australians and one New Zealander soldier asked to see an Australian officer in high command, who was visiting the prison, with a view to having the treatment exposed. This interview was refused, and the men decided to do no more work. This was called mutiny. They were all placed in different cells, and 16 n.c.o.'s of the M.P.S.C. MOST BRUTALLY FLOGGED THEM, AND THEY WERE ALL SENTENCED TO 35 DAYS' BREAD AND WATER. The so-called ringleaders were court-

APPENDICES.

martialled. The Australians, Privates Sheffield, Mitchell, Le Guor, and Little, were sentenced to life terms, AND THE NEW ZEALANDER AND A SCOTS SOLDIER WERE SENTENCED TO DEATH, WHICH SENTENCE WAS DULY CARRIED OUT.

In July, 1917, three men, namely Private Lackey (of the 1st Battalion), Private Cook (of the 24th), and Private Dickey (of the 23rd Battalion), A.I.F., escaped from the prison. They were recaptured and then handcuffed and flogged into insensibility with a sjambok. This punishment was carried out by Sergeant ———, of the M.P.S.C., assisted by Sergeant ———, of the D.C.L.S. The unfortunate victims were then placed in leg-irons and put on bread and water for a limited period. Privates Rawlinson and Vetchelow, for the same offence, were inflicted with the same punishment, administered by the same Sergeant ———, assisted this time by Sergeant ———, of the Scottish Rifles.

Another authentic case is that of Private Worby, of the 6th A.L.H., who, in company with Private Connors, of the 1st Battalion, A.I.F., escaped over the prison wall whilst an air raid was in progress. The rope broke, and Connors broke his leg in the fall. His comrade carried him a distance of eight kilometres before being overtaken by the military police. Worby received the same treatment as the others, but Connors, after being examined by a medical officer, was transferred to a casualty clearing station, and then admitted to No. 10 Australian Military Hospital as a patient. The doctor's orders were over-ruled, and Connors was removed to prison, where he was placed on a stretcher in a cell by himself. The only convenience provided was 15 paces away, and the wretched man HAD TO CRAWL THIS DISTANCE WITH HIS BROKEN LIMB TRAILING ON THE GROUND. He was also kept on bread and water for the limited period.

I have the names and addresses of others of my comrades who have been victims of this Hunnish treatment, and now the war has been won, I am going to put British justice to the test. I feel confident I can look to the R.S.S. Labor League to assist me in raising an agitation which will cause to bring about an inquiry into the treatment meted out to the Australian soldiers whilst away from their country. The Australian Government should call on the Imperial authorities for an explanation, and the responsible officials should be brought to book for countenancing such an awful system.

The following names may be of some use in case of investigation: General Humphreville (Director-General of Military Prisons in France), Colonel Thomas, Majors Mooney, Basher, and Douglas, Sergeant-Majors Coon, Dorkers, and Moran, and numerous staff-sergeants and non-coms. connected with the British military police, whose names I can furnish. I can also bring several witnesses (names supplied) to substantiate my case, who are prepared to give sworn evidence in any court of law.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

APPENDIX III.

The Parliamentary Order Paper, September 3, 1919, contained the following:—"Mr. Holland to move: That there be laid before this House a return showing—(1) The number of members of the New Zealand Expeditionary Force who, whilst on active service, have been sentenced to undergo punishment; (2) the number who actually served sentences so inflicted, and the nature of their punishment; (3) the number still undergoing punishment, and the nature of their sentences; (4) the number sentenced to death by order of court-martial; (5) the number of cases in which the death sentence was actually carried out; (6) the nature of the alleged offence for which soldiers were sentenced to either punishment or death; and (7) the names of the officers constituting the various courts-martial, and whether they were in every case New Zealand officers."

In my Address-in-Reply speech on September 5, I said: "Both Briggs and Baxter have said that when they first refused duty in France they were threatened with the death penalty. The General Orders were taken down and shown to them, and those orders, according to the officers who showed them, purported to contain lists of New Zealanders who were court-martialled and ordered to be shot for refusing to obey orders."

APPENDIX IV.

"Hansard" of September 5 contains a report of my speech on the Address-in-Reply, in the course of which I made reference to the Crampton case in the following terms:—

"Honourable members will remember the efforts I made last session to have Lieut. Crampton's case dealt with. When Mr. Hewitt, S.M., was appointed to inquire into the Crampton case, I asked that the men who had been assaulted should have the right of representation by counsel at that inquiry; Mr. McCombs made a similar request, but it was refused. The Magistrate went into the matter very fully. The men concerned had been scattered from prison to prison, and the guards had also been scattered. The Magistrate visited prison after prison. He acted as fairly as a man could act under the circumstances. He brought in a report which substantiated the charges of cruelty, and which vindicated my action and the action of the men who made the charges in the first case. Mr. Hewitt found that the charges against Crampton were proved; but it took a long time to get the report laid on the table of the House. After it was placed before the House we endeavoured to get the Government to take action on it, but no action was taken; and then, instead of the

APPENDICES.

Government giving effect to the recommendations of Mr. Hewitt, instead of doing what they ought to have done—the only thing they could have done in decency at that stage, namely, get rid of Lieut. Crampton as military officer—they set up a courtmartial to try Crampton, a courtmartial that was nothing more or less than a piece of whitewashing machinery to save Lieut. Crampton's position. No member of that Court betrayed any knowledge of the military law. The Judge-Advocate was better counsel for Crampton than the lawyer who was employed to defend him. The men who were the victims of the atrocities were not allowed representation by counsel, and at least one important witness was not presented. . . . The prosecutor was the one man who seemed to me to come out of the business with credit to himself. After the courtmartial, and without any explanation either in this House or to the people of this country as to why they did it, the Government, altogether ignoring the scathing report of the Magistrate, Mr. Hewitt, proceeded to appoint Lieut. Crampton Area Officer at Wanganui, where, notwithstanding that unsavoury record of his which comes from Samoa, he will have charge of very many boys in the period of adolescence. Previously I made demands in this House for the production of the papers in connection with Lieut. Crampton's trial at Samoa. The Minister replied to me that he would place on the table of the House such of those papers as were not confidential. The papers have not yet been laid on the table, and I want to know what portion of the papers will be regarded as confidential. Will that portion be so regarded which had to do with Lieut. Crampton's own admissions at his trial by courtmartial at Samoa? This matter of the Defence Department's action in connection with Lieut. Crampton is something which the House cannot afford to pass over very lightly; sooner or later explanations will have to be made, and sooner or later something will have to be done to determine Lieut. Crampton's connection with the Defence Forces."

APPENDIX V.

The following statement concerning a New Zealand incident was printed in "Truth" newspaper during July, 1918:

On the morning of Thursday, June 27, at six o'clock, a raid by the military and civil police was made on this scrub-cutting camp in the following manner: As I was about one of the first men to rise from my tent, after the gong had been sounded for breakfast, for the purpose of having the usual morning's wash, I was accosted by a man in civilian clothes, who was armed with a rifle, and gave the order to "Stand, or I'll shoot." Thinking it merely a joke on the part of one of my fellow-workers, I still proceeded, towel over my arm, towards the creek, a distance of about half a chain from the tent. I had only

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

got about halfway when I was suddenly struck down from behind with a baton, inflicting a wound an inch long on the crown of my head. While I was down I was again struck several times with the same weapon, and afterwards kicked on the thigh, which also shows two ugly bruises. Naturally, the brutal treatment I was receiving caused me to call for help, and, on one or two men coming out of their tents, they were met with a cry of "You will be all treated alike," this coming from another man, also in civilian clothes, who, at the same time, brandished a revolver in a threatening manner. One of my fellow-workers then asked what was the matter, and why they were attacking me. It was only then that they announced who they were, and their object for being there. I then asked: "Why did you not let me know who you are?" He then said to me: "You are a deserter." By this time I was handcuffed and then marched to the mess galley, where most of the other men had been marched. On the way to the mess galley they told me that I could consider myself a very lucky man for not being shot, as they had orders to shoot if anyone resisted. This I considered was very poor consolation for the brutal treatment I had received. When I arrived in the mess galley covered with blood—face, neck, head, and clothes—I was still handcuffed. The cook bathed my face, and it was only after the cook had asked several times of one of the officers to take the handcuffs off, in order that I might change my saturated blood-stained clothes, that they were removed. The result of the brutal attack naturally caused me severe pain and sleepless nights, not mentioning the loss of time and money through not being in a fit condition to work. In addition, I also lost my speech for one day, caused through calling for assistance, and could only make myself understood in a very low whisper. There was absolutely no attempt to evade or molest any of the officers, neither before nor after they announced their calling and their object. If such unnecessary and brutal conduct is adopted in every instance when a raid is being made, it is a slur on the traditional "British Fair Play and Justice." Another matter worth mentioning is the language used, one man being called a ——— without any provocation, by a military policeman, who, at the same time, presented a fixed bayonet, such language being no credit to any man wearing the King's uniform. This camp life is hard and strenuous enough, as anyone who has ever tried it knows, and surely because I am working in the back-blocks that is no reason why any officer should take advantage of a man's position to treat him like a wild dog. The work done here is extremely valuable to the country, and it is time some people recognised the fact, instead of sneering at the man who sacrifices all comforts to work as he does for an honest living. In conclusion, it may be stated that every man in this camp had his military papers (self in particular classed C2), or gave a satisfactory explanation of himself, which should prove to you that none of the men had anything to fear from a raid from the

APPENDICES.

military officers. I hope that there will be a full inquiry made into the matter herein referred to and some compensation granted to me for the personal injury I received, from the effects of which I am still suffering, and the loss of time from work.—Yours, etc.,

PATRICK HEALEY.

Vouching for the truth of the above statement are the following signatures: Ernest Keenan, George Bush, Harry McNae, K. Waltanen, F. Nelson, F. McClure, Frank Anson, Victor Manninen, S. Eriksen, William Lyndhurst, A. J. Collier, J. Norman.

APPENDIX VI.

During the first quarter of 1918, the Hon. T. M. Wilford appeared in a new role, namely, that of the censor of prison reading, and in his wisdom, concluded that "Stead's Review" must not be read by military prisoners, the reason being that it was "so depressing" and presumably not calculated to induce anti-conscriptionists to reconsider their attitude. Here follows some interesting correspondence on the subject:—

Hon. Sir James Allen, K.C.M.G., Minister of Defence, Wellington.

Dear Sir,— A client of mine, who is serving a sentence under the Military Service Act and is now detained at Waimarino Prison Camp, has written a letter to me. Since his imprisonment, he arranged with me for the supply of certain books, magazines, and papers, including, inter alia, "Stead's Review." He now writes me a letter intimating that "Stead's Review" is not admitted to the prison, but that an Australian magazine called "Life" and matter of a kindred type is admitted. My client has not written to complain of this, but mentions it incidentally. It seems to be an extraordinary thing that "Stead's Review" should be denied admission while "Life" is admitted, and I shall be glad to hear from you the reason of this prohibition and discrimination, and whether it is likely to be continued. I have the honour, Sir, to remain, yours truly, P. J. O'REGAN

February 13th, 1918.

P. J. O'Regan, Esq., Barrister and Solicitor, Wellington.

Dear Sir, I am in receipt of your letter of the 13th instant regarding the admission of the publication, "Stead's Review," to the Prison Camp at Waimarino.

In reply, I have to inform you that this is a matter which is not within the control of my Department, and would refer you to the Minister in Charge of the Prisons Department, the Hon. T. M. Wilford, who will, doubtless, be able to supply you with the necessary information.— Yours faithfully, J. ALLEN, Minister of Defence.

26th February, 1918.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

Hon. T. M. Wilford, Minister of Justice, Wellington.

Dear Sir,—A client of mine, Mr. P. Cody, who is at present serving a sentence in the Prison Camp at Waimarino, has written to me to the effect that "Stead's Review," to which he is a subscriber, has been denied admission to the prison. He adds that another publication called "Life," and similar periodicals, are still admitted. I wrote to the Minister of Defence directly after hearing from Mr. Cody, but he has now written me to the effect that it is a matter for you. I shall be glad to hear whether "Stead's Review" has, in fact, been prohibited from admission to my client, and if so, why? Thanking you in anticipation of an early reply.—Yours truly, P. J. O'REGAN.

4th March, 1918.

P. J. O'Regan, Esq., Wellington.

Dear Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, in reference to the complaint made to you by P. Cody, at present undergoing sentence at the Waimarino Prison Camp, of his not being allowed to receive "Stead's Review."

In reply, I have to inform you that the matter is receiving careful consideration.—Yours faithfully, THOMAS M. WILFORD.

5th March, 1918.

Hon. T. M. Wilford, Minister of Justice, Wellington.

Dear Sir,—I wrote you herein on the 4th March last and received an acknowledgment from you dated the 5th, in which you stated that the matter was receiving consideration, but, so far, have received no further reply.

I would point out that in my first letter I asked for no consideration whatever, but simply made an inquiry whether it was correct that while "Life" and similar periodicals were allowed admission to military prisons, "Stead's Review" was denied admission. I mentioned the fact that a client of mine then imprisoned, Mr. P. Cody, had written to me to the effect that the "Review" was refused admission to him, and my object was to ascertain whether this was due to the settled policy of the Department, or whether it was due merely to inadvertence. To my inquiry no reply has yet been vouchsafed, and I beg respectfully to repeat it. Thanking you in anticipation.—Yours truly, P. J. O'REGAN.

28th May, 1918.

P. J. O'Regan, Esq., Wellington.

Dear Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo in reference to the publication, "Stead's Review."

In reply, I beg to inform you that the circulation of "Stead's Review" in the prisons has been stopped because I consider it is so depressing.—I am, Yours truly, THOMAS M. WILFORD.

1st June, 1918.

APPENDICES.

Hon. T. M. Wilford, Minister of Justice, Wellington.

Dear Sir,—I duly received your letter of the 1st inst., and I note that the circulation of the "Review" in the prisons has been stopped because you consider it "so depressing." I respectfully submit that this information could have been vouchsafed to me when I wrote to you 4th March last. Under the circumstances, I am tempted to conclude that your reply dated the 5th of that month was dictated by the hope that I would not return for further information.

It will, no doubt, come in the nature of a surprise to many people that a Liberal Minister should have signalled his accession to office by preventing the circulation of a periodical so dispassionate, accurate, cultured, and influential as "Stead's Review."

In my previous communication I mentioned, incidentally, that no embargo whatever had been placed upon the circulation in the prison of "Life," an Australian publication. Doubtless the vaticinations of the Rev. Dr. Fitchett are not "so depressing," though it is submitted that in so far as the war is concerned, they are woefully inaccurate. The point, however, which concerns my client, Mr. Cody, and men of his race and religion, is that "Life" is inspired by a spirit of sustained venom and hatred of everything pertaining to Ireland and the Catholic Church, and, under the circumstances, I cannot repress a feeling of surprise at the discrimination you have seen fit to exercise. It is to the lasting credit of Mr. Stead that nothing ever appeared in his "Review" calculated to wound the patriotic or religious susceptibilities of any section of the community.

I consider the matter of such public importance that it is my intention to publish the whole of this correspondence.—Yours truly, P. J. O'REGAN.

12th June, 1918.

P. J. O'Regan, Esq., Solicitor, Wellington.

Dear Mr. O'Regan,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th instant.

In reference to your conclusions as to my last letter to yourself, I can assure you that the same are erroneous, and such reply was not dictated by the hope suggested in yours of the 12th—I would not so misjudge you.

Your reference to "Stead's Review" and to your client, Mr. Cody, show, in my opinion, an absence of logical reasoning. If, as you say, nothing appears in Mr. Stead's "Review" calculated to wound the religious susceptibilities of any section of the community, how can you argue that any question of religion was in my mind when "Stead's Review" was being dealt with? On your own statement you are surely answered.

I still believe that "Stead's Review" is depressing, and in this time of crisis and stress, I firmly and thoroughly believe that only those

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY.

efforts which go to help and aid "Our King and Empire" should be encouraged. My opinion is that Stead's magazine weakens effort.

I shall certainly have no objection to your publishing this correspondence.—I am, yours truly, THOMAS M. WILFORD.

17th June, 1918.

Hon. T. M. Wilford, Minister of Justice, Wellington.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 17th inst., herein. I am glad to have your assurance that I was in error in suggesting that you could have given me at once the information I sought in my letter of March 4th last. It is hardly necessary to add that I do not suggest that you have been influenced in the slightest degree by any disregard of the religious feelings of any section of the community. I thought, and still think, however, that it is not a little remarkable that no objection should be taken to such a production as "Life," the bias of which, in the direction mentioned in my previous letter, is obvious and notorious.

Needless to say, I do not propose discussing "Stead's Review" with you. The correspondence has removed the scepticism I felt at the outset, when I was invited to believe that a Liberal Minister of the Crown had seen fit to place such a magazine as "Stead's Review" on the Index of Imperialism.—Yours truly, P. J. O'REGAN.

18th June, 1918.

APPENDIX VII.

The Parliamentary Order Paper, September 3, contained the following question and answer:—

Mr. Holland (Grey) to ask the Minister of Defence: "Whether, in view of the fact that peace had been declared, the Government will consider the advisability of granting a general amnesty to soldiers undergoing imprisonment, and to other military offenders either undergoing or liable to imprisonment."

The Hon. Sir James Allen, Minister of Defence, replied: "It is not possible to grant a general amnesty to all soldiers at present undergoing imprisonment for offences committed overseas, as these unfortunately include a small proportion of serious criminal cases, and it is not considered that the declaration of peace warrants complete remission in all cases. Whenever a soldier arrives in the Dominion as a prisoner, his case is fully reviewed, and, wherever possible, he is given his freedom. In fact, at present, there is no soldier undergoing a sentence of imprisonment in New Zealand for an offence committed on active service overseas, but I am afraid there are a few still to come out whose cases will not justify a complete remission. So far as the military defaulters and shirkers are concerned, I may state that while orders have been given for the release of all those

APPENDICES.

who have been classified as bona fide religious objectors by the special Board, and those who were serving a second or third sentence for offences under the Military Service Act, the Government does not at present intend to remit the sentences of those who refused service for other reasons or to cease the prosecution of those who have so far evaded arrest."

This means that the Government denies the right of Conscience to the Socialist, the Irishman, the Maori, and the Christian other than the Christian as narrowly defined by the Military Service Act. It also means that the pursuit of the men with conscientious objections to military service is to be carried to its vicious extreme.

APPENDIX VIII.

Since the main pages of this book have been in print quite a number of C.O.'s therein recorded as "still in prison" have been released as a result of their sentences expiring on the one hand and of small remissions on the other.

Among those released as a result of expiry of sentence is Mr. P. C. Webb, ex-M.P. for Grey. Mr. Webb has been accorded a tremendous welcome at Auckland (where two theatres failed to accommodate the thousands who assembled to greet him, at Wellington (where one of the largest theatres was packed to the doors before 7.30, and many hundreds were turned away), at Christchurch, and at Greymouth (where the citizens made his return the occasion of one of the most remarkable demonstrations ever held in New Zealand).

PUBLICATIONS BY H. E. HOLLAND, M.P.

SAMOA

A Story that Teems with Tragedy

A Record of the agony of a Primitive People and their heroic struggles for Freedom.

A Record of Treaties made and torn up.

A Record of the Island Conflict of German, American, and British Trading Interests.

A Statement of Labour's Position re the Control of Samoa.

PRICE: 3d. Per dozen, 2/6.

ARMAGEDDON OR CALVARY: The Alternative for the Conscientious Objectors of New Zealand. Price, 2/

THE TRAGIC STORY OF THE WAIHI STRIKE. (In collaboration with "Ballot Box" and R. S. Ross.) Paper, 6d.; cloth, 2/-.

SEDITION: Holland's Speech from Dock in 1914. Price, 1d.

LABOUR AND THE FUSION: Should the Labour Party have joined the National Government? Debate with John Payne, M.P. Price, 2d.

THE COMMUNE OF PARIS: The First Great Socialist Revolution. Price, 3d.

LABOUR'S CHALLENGE TO THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT: Speech on the Address-in-Reply, House of Representatives, October, 1918. Price, 3d.

IN THE PRESS.

PATRIOTS AND PROFITEERS: A Second Chapter of N.Z. War Profits.

THE PEACE TERMS: The War Foundations they Build. Price, 3d.

BOY CONSCRIPTION AND CAMP MORALITY: The case against Sir James Allen's proposal for the Four Months' Camp Conscription of 18-year-old boys. Price, 3d.

FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM: A Summary of Marxian Theory of Value and a Statement of Labour's Objective. Price, 3d.

TO BE PUBLISHED.

IRELAND'S FAMINES AND REBELLIONS: The Ripe Fruit of Seven Hundred Years of Bondage.



A 001 238 412 9

WELLINGTON, N.Z.:

Printed by The Maori-
land Worker Printing
and Publishing Co.
Ltd., 290 Wakefield
:: :: Street :: ::
